The Evolution of the Country Community

(Revised Edition)

Warren H. Wilson

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

https://archive.org/details/evolutionofcount0000warr_i0q3

THE EVOLUTION OF THE COUNTRY COMMUNITY

THE EVOLUTION OF THE COUNTRY COMMUNITY

(Second Edition enlarged and thoroughly revised)

By

WARREN H. WILSON, Ph.D., D.D., LL.D.

Associate in Education, Teachers College, Columbia University

Director, Department of Church and Country Life, Board of Home Missions of the Presbyterian Church

Author of

Quaker Hill, The Church of the Open Country, etc.

LIBRARY OF
Bonebrake Theological Seminary
HT 421
.W5
1923
22,023

THE PILGRIM PRESS
BOSTON CHICAGO

Copyright, 1923
By SIDNEY A. WESTON

Printed in the United States of America

THE JORDAN & MORE PRESS
BOSTON

PREFACE

The significance of the most significant things is rarely seized at the moment of their appearance. Years or generations afterwards hindsight discovers what foresight could not see.

It is possible, I fear it is even probable, that earnest and intelligent leaders of organized religious activity, like thousands of the rank and file in parish work, will not immediately see the bearings and realize the full importance of the ideas and the purposes that are clearly set forth in this new and original book by my friend and sometime student, Dr. Warren H. Wilson. That fact will in no wise prevent or even delay the work which these ideas and purposes are mapping out and pushing to realization.

The Protestant churches have completed one full and rounded period of their existence. The age of theology, in which they played a conspicuous part, has passed away, never to return. The world has entered into the full swing of the age of science and practical achievement. What the work, the usefulness, and the destiny of the Protestant churches shall henceforth be will depend entirely upon their own vision, their common sense, and their adaptability to a new order of things. Embodying as they do resources, organization, the devotion and energy of earnest minds, they are in a position to achieve results of well-nigh incalculable value if they apply themselves diligently and wisely to the task of

holding communities and individuals up to the high standard of that "Good Life" which the most gifted social philosopher of all ages told us, more than two thousand years ago, is the object for which social activities and institutions exist.

In one vast field of our social territory the problem of maintaining the good life has become peculiar in its conditions and difficult in the extreme. The rural community has suffered in nearly every imaginable way from the rapid and rather crude development of our industrial civilization. The emigration of strong, ambitious men to the towns, the substitution of alien labor for the young and sturdy members of the large American families of other days, the declining birth-rate and the disintegration of a hearty and cheerful neighborhood life, all have worked together to create a problem of the rural neighborhood, the country school and the country church unique in its difficulties, sometimes in its discouragements.

To deal with this problem two things are undeniably necessary. There must be a thorough examination of it, a complete analysis and mastery of its factors and conditions. The social survey has become as imperative for the country pastor as the geological survey is for the mining engineer. And when the facts and conditions are known, the church must resolutely set about the task of dealing with them in the practical spirit of a practical age, without too much attention to the traditions and the handicaps of an age that has gone by.

It would not be possible, I think, to present these two aspects of the problem of the country parish with more of first-hand knowledge, or with more of the wisdom that is born of sympathy and reverence for all that

is good in both the past and the present than the reader will find in Dr. Wilson's pages. I welcome and commend this book as a fine product of studies and labors at once scientific and practical.

FRANKLIN H. GIDDINGS.

INTRODUCTION

The church and the school are the eyes of the country community. They serve as means of intelligence during the early development of the community. They help to develop the social consciousness, as well as to connect the life within the community with the world outside. They express intelligence and feeling. But when the community has come to middle life, even though it be normal, the eyes fail. They are infallible registers of the coming of maturity. At this time they need special treatment.

Like eyes, the country church and country school register the health of the whole organism. Whatever affects the community affects the church and the school. The changes which have come over the face of social life in the country record themselves in the church and the school. These institutions register the transformations in social life, they indicate health and they give warning of decay. In a few instances the church or school requires the attention of the expert even in the infancy of the community, just as the eyes of a child sometimes need the oculist, but with normal growth the expert is called in for the cure of the ills of maturity.

The church and the school are sometimes compared to the home and the three are spoken of as "institutions of country life"; but the household is in strong contrast to these two by reason of the fact that it is dominated by instinct, and the school and the church by conscious intellectual control.

Instinct-control is greater in the church than in the school, but in neither of them does instinct completely dominate reason as it does in the household. Those who make up the household are assembled by the gravitation of propinquity, kinship, economic and social accident, and marriage. None of them is consciously attracted or held by reason. The household is a complex of instinctive forces; whereas the church and the school are deliberately organized forms which are always under the reconstructive attention of appointed leaders.

Yet even the school is, in America, created by forces of custom, scarcely intellectual, almost instinctive. The American builds a school in his neighborhood with almost the same readiness which the ant uses in building his hill or the hornet his house of wood-pulp. The school needs in our time to be enlarged in its conception of community life. It requires a whole to work upon rather than a part. School people are sufficiently professional to satisfy themselves in their own institution. They work for nothing else. Without the same sanctions to justify their narrowness, they say about the school that which churchmen say of the church, that their whole life is consecrated to its service. Too often this means with school men that the school competes in their mind with other interests in the community. They do not see the school as it is described by the chief schoolmaster as "a supplementary institution in education."

In these chapters a center of attention will be the church, regarded as an institution for building and organizing country life. It is not the purpose of the writer to treat the church in ecclesiastical terms, but rather as a register of the well-being of the community.

The condition of the church is regarded as an index of the social and economic condition of the people. The sources of religion are believed by the writer to be in the vital experiences of the people themselves. In the process of religious experience the church, the Bible, the ministry, and other religious methods and materials are means of disciplining the forces of religion, but they are not the sources of religion. Religion is an expression of community life. It is beyond the control of reason, except in so far as church organizations, led by resolute men, may wield a modifying power. The area of their control is the community.

The church, above all other institutions in the country, should see what concerns country people as a whole. If vision be not given to the church, country people will suffer. The Christian churches are rich in the experience of country people. The Bible is written about a "Holy Land." The exhortations of Scripture, especially of the Old Testament, are in terms of constructive rural sociology, the building and organizing of an agricultural people in an Asiatic country. Many of the problems are Oriental, but some of them are precisely the same as are today agitating the American farmer. Religion sets the highest valuation upon life, and the country church should have vision of the present meaning as well as the future development of country life in America.

The country church ought to inspire. It is the business of other agencies, and particularly of the schools and colleges, to impart practical skill and economic knowledge. But these will not satisfy country people. No section of modern life is so dependent upon idealism as are the people who live in the country. Mere cash prosperity puts an end to residence in most country

communities. Commercial success leads toward the city. The religious leaders have the duty of inspiring country people with ideals higher than the commercial. It remains for the country church in particular to inspire individuals with social idealism, to develop a kingdom and a commonwealth. Her ideals have been those of an organized society. The tradition which she inherits from the past is saturated with family, tribal, and national remembrances. The preacher's exhortations for the future look to organized social life in the world to come. He should know how to construct out of modern life ideals which are organic and social.

Beyond these two duties I am not sure that the churches in the country have exceptional function. What is said in this book about the country school is said solely because of the dependence of all else upon this institution. The patient, detailed, and extensively constructive work in the country must be done by the educator. It is well for the church to recognize its limits, and to magnify its own function within them. Vision and inspiration are the duty of religious leaders. The application of these in a variety of ways to the generations of young people in the country is an educational task which the church can do only in part. In all parts of the United States country people are furnished with churches. In general the task of religious pioneering is done. These religious societies hold the key to the problem of country life. If they oppose modern socialized ideals, these ideals cannot penetrate the country. If the church undertake constructive social service in the country, the task will be done. The church can oppose effectively; it can support efficiently. This situation lays a vast responsibility upon all Christian

churches, especially upon those that have an educated ministry; for the future development of the country community as a good place in which to live depends upon the country church.

This is not the place to discuss whether a population can be improved and whether a community can be saved. The pages that are to follow will discuss these questions. It is the writer's belief that a population can be modified by social action, that the community is the unit in which service should be rendered in the country, and that by the vision and inspiration of the church in the country, this service is conditioned. He believes, with those who are leading in the service among the poor in the great cities, that the time has come when we have sufficient intelligence to understand the life of people, in order to deal with the causes of human action; we have sufficient resources wherewith to endow the needed agencies for the reconstruction of country life; and we have a sufficient devotion among men of intelligence and of means to direct this constructive social service toward the entire well-being of country people and of the whole commonwealth.

The writer is indebted for help in the preparation of this book to Miss Florence M. Lane, Miss Martha Wilson and to Miss Anna B. Taft, without whose assistance and criticism the chapters could not have been prepared and without whose encouragement they would not have been undertaken; also to his teachers in Columbia University, especially Professors Franklin H. Giddings and John Bates Clark, whose teachings in the Social Sciences furnish the beginning of a new method in investigating religious experiences.

CONTENTS

Chapter		
	Introduction	ix
I	Manor and Pioneer	3
II	The Household Farmer	20
III	Migrant and Exploiter	33
IV	The Husbandman	58
V	Exceptional Communities	74
VI	Kinds of People	91
VII	The Community	109
VIII	The Margin of the Community	131
IX	Public Health	149
X	Getting a Living	173
XI	Cooperation	189
XII	Common Schools	208
XIII	Recreation and Morals	223
XIV	Common Worship	240

THE EVOLUTION OF THE COUNTRY COMMUNITY

THE EVOLUTION OF THE COUNTRY COMMUNITY

I

MANOR AND PIONEER

The earliest settlers of the American wilderness had a struggle very different from our own. Their economic experience determined their character. They appear to us at this distance to have common characteristics, habits and reactions upon life, in which they differ from all who follow them in easier times. They have more in common with one another than they have in common with us. They differ less from one another than they differ from the modern countryman. The pioneer life produced the pioneer type.

To this type all their ways of life correspond. They hunted, fought, dressed, traded, worshiped in their own way. Their houses, churches, stores, and schools were built, not as they would prefer, but as the necessities of their life required. Their communities were pioneer communities; their religious habits were suitable to frontier experience. Modern men would find much to condemn in their ways; and they would find our present manners surprising, even wicked. But each conforms to type, and obeys economic necessity.

Change has dogged the footsteps of the American farmer. Restless he is still. Through all the course of variations of hunger and cold and lonely toil, he has adjusted himself to the dominant way of life. We Americans like to be dominated by an idea and by one idea at a time. We are freed of monarchs but not of the absolutism of an idea. We have had six successive ideas to rule the land we till: the manor, the cabin, the farm, the migrant, the speculator's dollar, and the co-operative business. Six dominating ideas in three hundred years; three of them in the past fifty years. While each idea rules in its turn, it will have no rival. Conservatism alone, that cherishes the past, modifies the dominance of one idea at a time.

From the settlement in 1607 in Virginia and 1620 in Massachusetts we were a post-manorial society dwelling on the seaboard. Then some went pioneering westward. The Ohio Valley was dominated until 1835 by the idea of free, solitary wandering. From that date, and from a century earlier on the seaboard states, the household farm ruled the hearts of men, a gracious rule, fertile in good thoughts. For two centuries and a half these Europeans lived in the American wilderness by imitating the dominating persons, conserving the past as best they could. In the early development of every part of the country, life was of necessity simple. The ideals imitated by all were powerful. In later stages of development the older ideals still ruled, but the complexity of society was attended by the dominance of a new principle and by the rule of new ideal types of mankind. In the decades before the Civil War they perfected a culture between the ocean and the Mississippi, which centered in the household.

This process of change under economic pressure, change with a future, was first recognized and described by Mr. J. B. Ross in an article in the *Political Science Quarterly* that has had great weight. Mr. Ross there described the consecutive stages of development which he called the pioneer, land farmer, and exploiting stages. His argument was that, in rural history, there is a continuing force and a sequence of human types. This proposition was the germ of the whole country life movement in America because of its influence upon Sir Horace Plunkett and Theodore Roosevelt. Although Mr. Ross spoke only of the Middle West, the principle which he discovered applies to the country as a whole, including the Colonial and Southern States. His statement of this succession of economic types should be quoted in full:

" The agrarian occupation of the Middle West divides itself into three periods. The first, which extends from the beginnings of immigration to about the year 1835, is of significance chiefly because of the type of immigrants who preempted the soil and the nature of their occupancy. The second period, extending from 1835 to 1890, had as its chief objective the enrichment of the group life. It was the period in which large houses and commodious barns were erected, and in which the church and the school were the centers of social activity. The third period, which began about the year 1890, and which is not yet complete, is marked by a transition from the era of resident proprietors of the land to that of non-resident proprietors, and by the fact that the chief attention of the land-owners is paid to the improvement of the soil by fertilization and drainage and to the in-

creasing of facilities for communication and for the marketing of farm products."[1]

Each of these periods, created by response to the necessities of life on the part of the people in getting their living, had its own kind of community, so that we have had pioneer, household farmer, migrant exploiter, and husbandman communities. Indeed all these types are, in Middle Western States, found contemporaneous with one another. We have also had successive churches built by the pioneer, by the land farmer, by the exploiter and by the husbandman. The present state of the country church and community is explained best by saying that it is an effect of transition from the pioneer and the land farmer types of church and community to the exploiter and husbandman type.

Before considering the pioneer period a word should be said here about the manor, which is not properly American but has influenced the Eastern States, particularly Massachusetts, New York, and Virginia. The manor was the medieval social form by which society controlled the tiller of the soil. When America was discovered and settled, the European manor had greatly changed its form, but the attempt was made to establish the manor on American soil, because the people knew no better way to settle Massachusetts, New York, and Virginia. Because of the hostile Indians and of the wilderness about, the early settlers found it profitable to live in compact villages, so that for a time the manor was sustained by some of the same conditions which fostered its growth in the wild ages after the fall of Rome. It was a social form suitable to the tillage of the soil in the midst of a wilderness.

[1] *The Agrarian Changes in the Middle West*, by J. B. Ross, in *Political Science Quarterly*, Vol. XXV, p. 625.

The manor was, to the earliest Europeans who colonized North America, the usual way of living upon the land, though there was no longer a " three field system " of tilling the soil. They knew no other way to possess the earth than the manorial way, which came to them from the Middle Ages. It has completely disappeared from sight in America. The student of our social history is prone to inquire whether the farm will not also disappear. We know no other way to till the soil except the farm. We are dominated by the farm ideal as they were dominated by the manor.

The manor[2] was an organization of country life under a lord of the land who combined with the ownership of the soil the powers of magistrate, certain rights in legislation and finally the powers ecclesiastical. The assembly of these in one person made a social figure as admirable to them as the farmer was to our fathers. Upon the land under the control of the lord were serfs, villeins, slaves, and other subordinate social types, each with his designated place and privileges, or with none; but all under the regulated domination of the lord. When the Europeans came to Virginia and to Massachusetts they brought this ideal and attempted to organize it in America. In Massachusetts they succeeded in setting up an organization, greatly modified, in which the lord of the land was replaced by the congregation. To individuals were granted only limited holdings. None could buy or sell without consent of the town. The rights and duties of individuals in the New England town were analogous to those possessed by the

[2] *The Rural Community, Ancient and Modern*, by Sims, Scribners. *Old Virginia and Her Neighbors*, by John Fiske. *Economic and Social History of New England*, by Weeden. *The Quit-Rent System in the American Colonies*, by Bond. Yale University Press.

subordinate persons and families on the manor. The powers of the lord of the land were exercised by the town government and in the earlier days of the New England town by the church. The forces at work upon these European settlers quickly altered manorial organization, yet the New England town remains as an American type descended from the manor. Only in such altered social types did the manor reproduce itself in America.

Land on the shores of the Hudson River from New York to Albany was granted to manorial owners by royal act, on condition that the lord of the land should settle upon his acres a specified number of tillers of the soil. These American lords of the land received either about seven miles on both sides of the river or fourteen miles on one side, an estate extending backward from the river about thirty miles. The head of the manor in this case was called a Patroon. Many old New York families are descended from the Dutch and English patroons.

"The Charter (of the West India Company, of Holland,) provided for a form of colonization under patroons, such colonies to consist of fifty adults, and the lands occupied to run sixteen miles in length on one side of a navigable river or eight miles if on both banks, but only so far into the country as the occupiers should push their settlements. The limits of the colonies might be increased in proportion to the number of immigrants. The patroons had special privileges of grade, and magisterial powers: but courts were held on the manors, and later their representatives sat for them in this colonial assembly."[3]

[3] *Encyclopedia Britannica*, Ninth Ed., Vol. XVII, p. 454.

Tenants were discontented and disorders arose, culminating in the " Anti-Rent War " about 1767, which took the form of local insurrections in Dutchess and Columbia Counties and required the presence of British troops to quell the uprising. The forces at work in America were not the same as those which maintained the manor a thousand years earlier. The Revolution ended the manorial rents and exactions. There was no further extension of the manor in the inland sections. The Hudson River manors passed away because they could not in the face of the American wilderness control the independent colonials of the eighteenth century.

In Virginia and Maryland the manor was established and had a similar brief history. Here the white subordinates of the manor were indentured and the negroes were slaves. The great families of Virginia were in some instances manorial lords, as John Fiske has shown. But in Virginia the manor had fit occasion in which to reproduce itself in the conditions of tobacco and cotton culture, which were suitable to the employment of slave labor. The plantation, therefore, was devised as a permanent form of the manor. The slave owner took the place of the manorial lord. For one hundred years in the Southern States this adapted form of the manor persisted, until, in the Civil War, slavery was abolished and the plantation system it depended upon passed with it from national concern.

With the development of the American colonies manorial management and American community organization fell afoul of each other. Its influence upon the Eastern States, however, was very great. It had much to do with the creation of the New England town, an American form to be widely imitated in the westward

migration. The manor also determined the form of residence of certain seaboard areas. Its influence is seen there still in the population it deposited and in the form of holding the land.

The break-up of the manor was by the independent venturing of separate families. Men departed from the manorial village and from the control of the lord of the manor into the wilderness to build their own cabins, and they took with them the household form, the unit of organization on which the manor depended. With the break-up of the manor, purely American forces took control of the westward population. On American soil the manor did not repeat itself. It was a European expedient, transplanted to our soil without the political force which kept it alive in Europe.

The forces at work both within and round about the Colonial population sent them forth from the manors and from individual households as pioneers. It was impossible to chain to one place the foot of the European who had stepped upon this continent. Among these immigrants were many bold, resolute, insubordinate spirits. They were repelled by the austere rule of the church in New England and Virginia, the heavy subjection of the Hudson River manors, and the penurious rule of the Penns in Pennsylvania. They were constantly piercing the western border of the settlements in hunting excursions and finding it possible to live in the wilderness either with the Indians or in defiance of their loose tribal government. In 1770 Daniel Boone began to lead them through the defiles of the Appalachian ranges to the "Fall of the Ohio." These men created a type of American who has dominated our subsequent history. The history of their exploits and the emotional

power of their example penetrated all the American settlements. Every man, woman and child told over the tale of their doings and felt in himself the response to their example. And so the colonies became dominated by the ideal of the pioneer. Even until the present those early solitary fighters and hunters have a power over our literature, our education, and our religion.

The pioneer lived alone. He placed his cabin without regard to social experience. In the woods his axe alone was heard, and on the prairie the smoke from his sod house was sometimes answered by no other smoke in the whole horizon. He worked and fought and pondered alone. Self-preservation was the struggle of his life, and personal salvation was his aspiration in prayer. His relations with his fellows were purely democratic and highly independent. The individual man with his family lived alone in the face of man and God. The following is a description by an eye witness of such a community which preserves in a mountain country the conditions of pioneer life.[4]

"It is pitiful to see the lack of cooperation among them. It is most evident in business but makes itself known in the children, too. I regard it as one reason why they do not play; they have been so isolated that they do not allow the social instinct of their natures to express itself. This, of course, is all unconsciously done on their part. However, one cannot live long among them without finding out that they are characterized by an intense individualism. It applies to all that they do, and to it may be attached the blame for all the things which they lack or do wrongfully. If a man has been wronged, he must personally right the wrong. If a man

[4] Rev. Norman C. Schenck.

runs for office, people support him as a man, and no questions are asked as to his platform. If a man conducts a store, people buy from him because he sells the goods, not because the goods commend themselves to them. And so, by common consent and practice, the individual interests are first. Naturally this leads to many cases of lawlessness. The game of some of our people is to evade the law; of others, to ignore the law entirely."

The pioneer had in his religion but one essential doctrine — the salvation of the soul. His church had no other concern than to save individuals from the wrath to come. It had just one method, an annual revival of religion.

The loneliness of the pioneer's soul is an effect of his bodily loneliness. The vast outdoors of nature, — forest, prairie, or mountain, — made him silent and introspective even when in company. The variety of impacts of nature upon his bodily life made him resourceful and self-reliant, and upon his soul resulted in a reflective, melancholy egotism. His religion must therefore begin and end in personal salvation. It was a message, an emotion, a struggle, and a peace.

The second great characteristic of the pioneer was his emotional tension. His impulses were strong and changeable. The emotional instability of the pioneer grew out of his mixture of occupations. It was necessary for him to practise all the trades. In the original pioneer settlement this was literally true. In later periods of the settlement of the land the pioneer still had many occupations, and representative sections of the country even until the present time exhibit a mixture of occupations among country people most unlike the

ordered life of the Eastern States. Between each two economic processes there is generated for the worker at varied trades a languor which is the source of the emotional instability of the pioneer.

The pioneer's method of bridging the gap between his many occupations was simple. When he had been hunting, he found it hard to go to plowing; and if plowing, on the same day to turn to tanning or to mending a roof. When the pioneer had spent an hour in bartering with a neighbor, he found it difficult to turn himself to the shoeing of a horse or the clearing of land. For this new effort his expedient was alcohol. He took a drink of rum as a means of forcing himself to the new occupation. The result is that alcoholic liquors occupy a large place in the economy of every such pioneer people.

In the mountain regions of the South, where the pioneer remains as an arrested type, the rum jug occupies the same place in the economy of the countryman as it occupied in the early settlements of the United States generally. These " contemporary ancestors " of ours in the Appalachian region have all the marks of the pioneer. Their simple life, their varied occupations, and the relative independence of the community and household, sufficient unto themselves, present a picture of the earlier American conditions. It is obvious among them that in " the settlement " the emotional condition of the pioneer grew out of his economy and extended itself into his church.

This emotional instability of the pioneer shows itself in his social life. The feuds of the mountain people exhibit this condition. Feeling is at once violent and impulsive. The very reserve of these unsmiling and

serious people is an emotional state, for the meager diet and heavy continued strains of their economic life poorly supply and easily exhaust vitality.

The frontier church exhibited emotional variability. It expressed itself in the pioneer's one method, namely, an annual revival of religion. In the pioneer churches there were no Sunday schools or other societies. In those regions in which the pioneer economic life has remained the type, Sunday schools do not thrive. Societies for young people, for men, women, and children do not there exist. The church is a place only for preaching. Religion consists of a message from a soul to a soul. Preaching is had as often as possible, but not necessarily once a week. Essential, however, to the pioneer's organization of his churches is a periodical revival. The means used at this time are the announcement of a gospel message and the arousing of emotion in response to this message. There is little application of religious imperative to the details of life. There is no recognition of social life, because the pioneer economy is lonely and individual. The whole process of religion consists in "coming through"; in other words, the procuring of an individual and highly personal experience of emotion.

"Beneath the surface of life in these people, so conservative and so indifferent to change as it is, there runs a strain of intense emotionalism. When storms disturb the calm exterior, the mad waves lash and beat and roar. And in religion this is most apparent. With them emotionalism and religion are almost interchangeable quantities, — if they are not identical."[5]

The pioneer church has not fully passed away. Its

[5] Rev. Norman C. Schenck.

one doctrine and its one method have still a place in the more elaborate life of the modern church. Like the rum jug, which is preserved for medicinal purposes, the revival has a use in the pathology of modern church life. The doctrine of personal salvation, which is of chief concern in the ministry to the adolescent population of the modern church, is just as vital as ever; though it is not the only doctrine of the church of the husbandman which has come in the country.

A relic of the pioneer days is the custom known as the Circuit or "Group System." By this a preacher comes to a church once a month, or twice, and preaches a sermon, returning promptly to his distant place of residence. The early settlers of this country who originated this system were lonely and individualized. They believed that religion consisted in a mere message of salvation, so that all they required was to hear from a preacher once in a while.

But the districts in which the "Circuit System" is used have grown beyond this religious satisfaction and the system no longer renders adequate religious service. Religion has become a greater ministry than can be rendered in the form of a message, however well preached.

There was no school created by the pioneers. Schools were indeed transported from Europe in this time to cities on the eastern seaboard, but solitary living did not call for any organized school. The very essence of its self-reliant individualism excluded formal education. There could be no teacher when every man was practising all trades; for each was a teacher and no one was a pedagogue. Education consisted in imitating the individual who succeeded. Life was one series of exploits.

It had to be acquired by personal contact, not learned from a specialized class.

The pioneer days are gone. Only in the southern Appalachian region are there arrested communities in which, in our time, the ways of our American ancestors are seen. The community builder cannot change the type of his people. He can only wait for the change, and enable his people to conform to the new type. For this process new industries, new ways of getting a living are necessary. The teacher or pastor can do something to guide his people in the selection of constructive instead of destructive industry.

In Kentucky and in the mountain counties of Tennessee and North Carolina lumbering and mining industries are for the time being employing the people. The result will be a deeper impoverishment; for the timber is the people's greatest source of actual and potential wealth, the land their storehouse. The leaders of the mountain people should teach reforestation with a view to maintaining the people's future wealth.

In a mountain county of Kentucky a minister seeing that his people needed a new economic life, before they could receive the religious life of the new type, organized an annual county fair. To this he brought, with the help of outside friends, a breed of hogs better than his mountain people knew and corn of a new pedigree. He cultivated competition in local industries, weaving and cooking; and started his people on the path of economic success of a new type.

The pioneer was individualistic and emotional. These traits were caused by his economic experience. While that experience lasted, he could be made no other sort of man than this. To this type his home and his

business life and his church conformed. Within these characteristics the efficiency of his social life was to be found.

Social life is cumulative. All earlier types persist. In the community dominated by husbandmen you will find pioneers, exploiters, and other individualists. The structure of the community of husbandmen, the most mature farming community we have produced, is of the household pattern. The personal property which is the basis of the household is preserved and perpetuated in the most mature community of all. In the earlier periods there was no foresight of the later. There could not be in early American life a period of farm exploitation, a speculation such as we have had in the past two decades. In the pioneer period, there could not be an elaborate household organization, but the earlier types survive in the later period. The philosophy of early American life dominates the later time. The convictions and ideals which one may rely upon and be sure to find in every country community, however advanced, are the ideals of solitary farming and of household farming.

Each of the types of character which emerged in American agricultural history tended to make his own community. The interaction between the external world and the types of mind which appeared resulted in exclusive social organizations corresponding to the successive types which we shall study. Certain great transitions, some of which Professor Ross has described, the changes from one period to another, were made by the changes in getting a living; that is, the necessity of life selected for dominance those men who bore the traits suited to mastering the circum-

stances of the time. In the order of early development the household farmer was probably the first to emerge, for the household, like the manor, was European. In the order of social causation the pioneer was the first American type created. Taking the country as a whole, he is first to be considered. The given fact in American life which selected the earliest leaders of communities was the wilderness, in which men must live alone. The first real American was the man who with axe and gun and knife could provide for himself and live apart from other men, from the time of Pocahontas to the period of the Klondike. The discoverer of tobacco and the prospector for gold were both pioneers selected by the wilderness. To be a pioneer a man had to be born but for leadership. In the pioneer period the persons capable of enduring the wilderness were selected to survive; others perished or stayed in the rear of the westward transition. Men incapable of solitary living fell behind. Women who could not endure the brooding solitude and silence of the wilderness, for days and nights and weeks and years, soon perished. Those who were born and trained to solitary living, to individual initiative, pressed westward and gathered around themselves men and women of like spirit in pioneer communities. They became the progenitors of a bold, independent people.

The change from one type of community to another has been due to necessity. The household farmer has emerged from the manorial farming at the beginning and also from solitary farming of the successful later periods. This change did not come by persuasion or by any one's conscious foresight. It was not preached or taught, but necessity brought it about, for these early Americans were in constant grips with stark necessity.

The old household farmers disapproved with vigor of the wild excesses, the turbulent passions, and the bitter feuds of the solitary farmers before them. Likewise migration came and exploitation of man, by reason of forces to be studied later, which gave an advantage to the individual, typically reacting according to type in the new social medium.

Between each of these periods and its predecessor was a bitter controversy. The writer of history finds rich material in the decades from 1800 to 1840, from 1860 to 1870, and when we have passed to a better perspective the years from 1890 on will prove equally fertile. The troubles of the modern church in the country are due to a social reconstruction of which the church is a register. The problem of the country school is one of adaptation to the new time. The first exercise in either case is investigation, the ascertaining of what the new time is. School-teachers and preachers do not persuade the age to change, though they think they do it. They do not lead but follow. The change itself is inevitable. It is of the domain of necessity.

II

THE HOUSEHOLD FARMER

The term household farmer is used to describe the man who tilled the soil in all parts of the country after pioneer days. He is usually called simply the farmer. This is the type with which we are most familiar in our literature and in dramatic representations of the country. The household farmer is the type of countryman who, in the Middle West about 1835, succeeded the pioneer, and about 1890 was followed by the exploiter of the land.

In every one of the settlements on the eastern seaboard there were households which produced for themselves all the goods they needed. Very early the farm family appeared in America imitating the household of the yeoman of England, idealizing his example, confronting the wilderness with resolution and satisfying its own wants with competent skill and management. Mr. Ross says that "the household group was enriched," in the Middle West about 1835. From the first settlement of the Colonial States the household group was a perfect social machine for the control of the soil and the satisfying of human wants. Especially in Pennsylvania did the household group thrive. William Penn's advertisement for settlers was addressed to those populations in Europe which had worked out in the best measure their release from the manor. The English Quakers and the Mennonites of Dutch, German, and Swiss towns were already free of the idea of the manor when Penn offered to them a place in his "Holy Experiment." Out

from Philadelphia earliest went a new influence in America. The new force was a social form which we call the household farm. By the time of the Revolution the manorial experiments had been terminated and the household farm had prevailed throughout the Colonial and Southern States, except where plantations had supplanted the manor with an even sterner rule. By that time Pennsylvania, which had a start over the other states in the perfection of the household group, was showing an excellence in agriculture which it still maintains in its eastern counties.

In the Eastern States pioneer days ended before 1835. Indeed, on those parts of the Seaboard States which were influenced by the manor the transition was from manor to household farming. The household farmer was the prevailing type throughout New England, New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania before the year 1800. In the South the contemporary of the household farmer was the planter or slaveholder. The connection between the plantation and the manor has been remarked upon.

The modified type in the South was due to an economic difference. The labor problem was solved in the South by chattel slavery; in the North by the wage system. It is true that throughout much of the South the small farmer held his own. These men conformed to the type of the household farmer. But in the South they did not dominate social and political life as the slaveholder did. In the Eastern States the whole social economy was, until a generation after the Civil War, dominated by the household farmer.

The characteristics of the household farmer are: first, his cultivation of the first values of the land. His order of life is characterized by initial utility. He lived

in a time of plenty. The abundance of nature, to the pioneer a detriment, was to the farmer a source of wealth. He tilled new soil and he cut primeval forest timber, he explored the earth for mines, seeking everywhere the first values of a virgin land. As these first values were exhausted, he moved on to new territories. All his ideas of social life were those of initial utility. The rich man was the admired citizen because there was more than enough for all. The policies of government were dominated by the ideas of a land-holding people. Individualism proceeded on radiating lines from any given center. The development of personality is the clue to the history of that period.

The second characteristic of the farmer was his development of the household group. He differed from the pioneer, whose life was lonely and individual, in the perfection of group life in his period. He differs from the exploiter who succeeds him in the country today in that exploitation has weakened the family group. The experience of the farmer compacted and perfected the household group in the country. The beginnings of this group life were in the pioneer period, but there was not quiet in which the family could develop nor were there resources by which it could be endowed. The classic period of American home life is that of the "land farmer." The typical American home, as it lives in sentiment, in literature, and in idealism, is the home of the household farmer.

Third, the household farmer owned his home. He built upon his farm a homestead which in most cases represented his ideal of domestic and family comfort. He built for permanence. So far as his means permitted he provided for his children and for generations of

descendants after them. He consecrated the soil to his people and to his name by setting apart a graveyard on his own land, and there he buried his dead.

The relation of the household farmer to his home and to the family group has been much used by writers, who in that time contemplated with the utmost satisfaction the perfect social organization of the household group. Whittier has illustrated this with the perfection which no consciously social writer can excel in the poem "Snow Bound," a lyrical expression of the perfection of the household group and of its independence of all the world without. A sociologist might envy the use of so perfect a medium to express and to describe a vital social form.

The cooperation of families in neighborly ways in this time was very perfect. All kinds of social meetings in which family life was idealized and enjoyed came to pass. The conception of the farmer as a gentleman prevailed through the United States during the time before the Civil War. Not all conceived themselves to be so privileged; but farming was thought to lead to a life in which leisure and social dignity rewarded labor. This was the basis of a prevailing equality. Free intermarriage was the ideal, as it was conceived that "there are no classes in America." Exceptions to this were known and clearly recognized, but country people thought that all owners of land should be and could be gentlefolk. Therefore, social meetings were all of extraordinary character. In these times everybody went to everything. Husking bees and other gatherings of the countryside in the form of play dramatized the toil of the fields in enjoyable social meetings, and gave a dignity and warmth to country life which it has in later days lost.

"The farmer type produced a definite social life," says Mr. Ross. "The second period, extending from 1835 to 1890, had as its chief objective the enrichment of the group life."

Fourth, the household farmer had neighbors. His well-developed family group would not have been possible without other groups in the same community. The independence of the family was relative, being perfected by imitation and economic competition. The land-farmer type came to maturity only when the whole of the land was possessed, when on every side the family group was confronted with other family groups, and neighborliness became universal. The family group is dependent through intermarriage and relationship upon other groups in the community. Family relationships thus came in the land-farmer communities to be very general. Some rough and crude forms of economic cooperation also grew up in this period, as modifications of the competition on which the land-farmer type is based.

Fifth, the household farmer competed, by group conflict, with his neighbors. Property was regarded by the household farmer as a family possession. Competition was between group and group, between household and household. The moral strength as well as the moral deficiencies of this type of man flow from this competition. He considered himself essentially bound to the members of his own group by obligations and free from moral obligations to others. The son received no wages from his father for work on the farm and the daughter did not dream of pay or of an allowance for her labors in the house. The household farmer conceived of his estate as belonging to his family group and embodied in

himself. Therefore he had no wage obligations to son or daughter, and he felt himself obliged so to distribute his property as to care for all the members of his household. This economic competition compacted the family group and formed the basis for the social economy of the country community. The household farmer had no ideal of community prosperity. His thought for generations has been to make his own farm prosperous, to raise some crop that others shall not raise, to have a harvest that other men have not, and to find a market which other men have not discovered, by which he and his farm and his group may prosper. It is hard for the household farmer, because of his immersion in this group conflict, to conceive that the farmer's prosperity is dependent upon the prosperity of other groups in the community.

The household group in the country is the social form of highest interest. It is to the rural social student the minutest sub-division of human society. Some one has called it the "We-group." It appears and plays a part in urban life as well, but nowhere is it so significant as among country people because there it is the organizing unit. American country life inheriting household group organization from Europe perfected it in the household farmer period. It remains the characteristic mode of country life and work in the day of husbandry. Community organization does not dissolve the household group but avowedly strengthens it. The "We-group," in rural social life, is the largest number of human individuals who respond alike to common stimuli, including the stimuli of land, kinship, and labor. There we have a maximum response to the common stimuli of the country. Among these stimuli are always to be found

the influences of neighborhood, of kinship and of the quest for economic supplies. The presence of the small group is the sign of normal social life. The group is not complete in itself, but is a unit in human association.

So the farmer economy had its social life and its own type of communities. The economy of the farmer period represents the ideals born in the pioneer days. The community of the farmer is the destination of the ideals and hopes of the period of the life of the pioneer. The farmer still practises a variety of occupations. His tillage of the soil and his household economy are the most conservative in all the American population. He uses modern machinery in the fields, but his wife uses the old mechanisms in the kitchen and in the household. The laborers employed on the farm are received into the farmer's family under conditions of social equality. The man who is this year a laborer may in a decade be a farmer. The dignifying of personality with landownership has been such a general social experience in the country that every individual is thought of in the farmer period as a potential landowner.

The institutions of the household farm community were the country store, rural school, the church, the grist-mill and the blacksmith shop. Each of these conformed strictly to the rôle of subordinate institution. The household was thought to be sufficient for a man to live by, and in many instances it was. At the beginning the store was a clearing-house of hand-made and homespun goods. It arose when some division of labor appeared, one household devoting itself to weaving, another to the preparation of meats, and still another to brewing and distilling. In the day-book and ledger of a country store in New York State in the latter part of the eight-

eenth century, the goods handled appear to be those made in the neighborhood and only salt, silk, tea and spices were imported.

A good example of the changes experienced by a self-sufficing family of the Middle West is that of a certain Illinois farmer, who less than a generation ago died. He left, at his demise, about 1900, to each of his four sons a farm, purchased with the money which a new order of life brought to him in the middle of the nineteenth century. At the beginning of his life in the household farm period before the Civil War he had no money. The bulk of products of his big farm he sold to contractors or middlemen, and the smaller quantities, as of butter, eggs, a few hogs or small portions of hay or railroad ties, he sold to the store. All that he bought he got from the store in exchange and the storekeeper was constantly in debt to him. This money, with his other receipts, was devoted only to the purchase of land, so that, at his death, this household farmer was the possessor of a great estate, to be divided among his children. At the beginning, however, he had learned how to subsist independently of his neighbors. His household was self-sufficing and he maintained this way of life to the end.

The general storekeeper of this type in the country is at once a business man, money lender, an employer of labor and the manager of the social center. He sells goods at a price so low as to maintain his local trade against outside competition. He loans money on mortgages throughout the community, and sells goods on credit. Judgment of men and of properties is so essential to his business that if he cannot judiciously loan and give credit he cannot maintain a country store. Around his warm stove in the winter and at his door in summer

gather the men of the community for discussion of politics, religion, and social affairs. In addition to all else, he has usually been the postmaster of the community.

The one-room rural school which is the prevailing type throughout the country is a product of the land-farmer period. Its prevalence shows that we are still in land-farmer conditions; and the criticism to which it is now subjected indicates that we are conscious of a new epoch in rural life.

It fits well into the life of the land farmer because it gives obviously a mere hint of learning. It has been the boast of its advocates that it taught only the " three R's." Its training for life is rudimentary only: it gives but an alphabet. The land farmer expected to live in his group. Secure in his own acres and believing himself " as good as anybody," he relied not upon trained skill for his son and daughter, but upon native abilities, sterling character, independence, and industry. Of all these the household, not the school, is the source. So that the one-room country school was satisfactory to those who created it.

In another chapter the common schools are more fully discussed. Here it may be said only that the creation of such a system was an honor to any people. The farmers who out of a splendid idealism placed a schoolhouse at every cross-roads, on every hilltop and in every mountain valley, exact a tribute of praise from their successors. The unit of measurement of the school district, on which this system was based, was the day's journey of a child six years of age. Two miles must be its longest radius. The generation who spanned this continent with the measure of an infant's pace, mapped the land into districts, erected houses at the centers, and

employed teachers as the masters of learning for these little states, were men of statesmanlike power. The country school is a nobler monument of the land farmer than anything else he has done.

The rural academy was the most influential school of the household farmer's time. Suggested by Benjamin Franklin as a school of real life, it was organized in 1772 and was multiplied in various parts of the country, especially in New England, Pennsylvania, and older Eastern States. It was often under the control or influence of the parish minister, at least at the beginning. It exerted a great influence for the building up of the church and of fine contagious culture. Its students were from the locality, being selected by their ambition for learning and by their ability to pay tuition.

Academies have generally been superseded in the development of the public school by high schools which, supported out of public funds secured by taxation, make a very general appeal and devote themselves without economic discrimination to educating in the higher life and the finer culture the ambitious sons of all the people. Even if the teachers are not as liberal minded and idealized in their devotion to books and the selection of students not exclusively drawn from the households of cultured people, the high school may claim to have inherited the work of the academy and greatly to have enlarged it. Moreover, the original purpose of the academy was to educate the ambitious young men and women for real life. There was an aristocratic defect in the academy system; the more democratic high school supported by public funds and controlled by the servants of the whole people can better accomplish even this end. The public-school system is capable of quicker

response to the needs of the time than a system dependent upon the support of a few like-minded and well-to-do people.

The development of the high schools has generally resulted in the abandonment of the academies. A few have survived and have adapted themselves to new times. But it is to be doubted whether the common schools have so far done as much for building and for organizing country communities, for providing local leadership, for building churches, as did the rural academies of New England, Pennsylvania, and other Eastern States.

The farmer's church is the classic American type of church at its best. The farming economy succeeded the pioneer economy without serious break. The troubles of the country church have their beginnings in the period of the exploiter, which is to follow; but the farmer developed the church of the pioneer with sympathy and consistency. The church of the farmer still values personal salvation above all. The revival methods and the simplicity of doctrine of pioneer traditions passed over into the churches of the household farmer period.

In using the term household farmer I am aware of its close resemblance to the term exploiter. The word itself points to exploitation of land. The farmer has farmed the raw materials of the country. He tilled the soil until its fertility was exhausted and then moved on to the newer regions of the West, again to farm and to exploit the virgin riches of a plenteous land. The planter in the South, possessing frequently more than a thousand acres, was accustomed to till a portion of one hundred, two hundred or four hundred acres, until its fertility had been exhausted. Then he moved his slaves

to another section, cleared the land and cultivated it until its power to produce had also been exhausted. The difference between land-farming and exploitation is the absence of speculation in land in the former period.

The household farmer's dominance of the country, begun in the early settlement of Pennsylvania,[1] advanced with the break-up of the manors to the north and south of Pennsylvania, and extended up to the time of the Civil War, when westward migration introduced a new dominant idea. In the Middle West it ruled the land after the pioneer ideals had waned, but the war between the states was followed by disturbing forces, farm machinery, great railroads, new ideas, which turned the attention of the members of the household group away from their proud self-sufficiency. All the centuries of European history led the minds of men up to this ideal of independent homes. The decades of American history culminated in this self-reliant household. It was an ideal so dear to the heart of freedom-loving men that literature was born of it. The household farm was the mother of writers of all degrees, poets, philosophers and preachers who characterized this time and enriched it greatly. For centuries the hopes of men had waited for such a day as this. The heirs of these hopes saw the meaning of their time. Whittier's poetry, Emerson's philosophy and the writings of Hawthorne were the fruit of these long-deferred hopes. The oldest and best lyric poetry on American lips is a gift of this time. This experience of independent households gave frame and form to American political philosophy. Thomas Jefferson was the attorney of the

[1] But see *Quit Rents* for evidence that Pennsylvania also was settled in the post-manorial way.

household, and Abraham Lincoln its statesman. The fifty years that have followed have been, so far as country life is concerned, comparatively infertile. Worry and unrest in the parents on the farm do not incline their sons to song or their daughters to the writing of stories.

Most of the household farmers have put the loom away. The spinning-wheel is not to be found except in the very old garret or in the museum. Around the older farmsteads the iron work of the forge has been trodden into the soil. The handicraft of the self-sufficing farmer's skill has gone under the dust heap. But the farm family remains. The land is still tilled in separate units, each enumerated by the census as an industrial group. In sections retarded by mountain barriers one finds still the calm faces and the well-poised, independent heads on competent shoulders of men and women who produce so great a proportion of what they consume that they think themselves to be independent of the world. While it lasted, the household farm period fixed our traditions, moulded our sentiments and generated our numerous institutions. But it is rapidly passing. Worry over middlemen has taken the place of loyalty to his household group in the mind of the farmer. Within the first two decades of the twentieth century the farmer has awakened from his discouragement. There is today a new type of farmer, as commanding a figure in business as his grandfather was in dominating land, domestic animals, plants, and the work of men upon the land.

III

MIGRANT AND EXPLOITER

The third type in American agriculture is the migrant and the fourth is the exploiter. Between the farmer and the husbandman there is an economic revolution. In fact these are transition types between farmer and husbandman. " The fundamental problem in American economics always has been that of the distribution of land," says Mr. Ross. The exploiter is, as the migrant was, a temporary economic type, created in the period of redistribution of land. The characteristic of the exploiter is his commercial valuation of all things. He is the man who sees only the value of money.

The great wars have been disturbers of peace long years after the clash of their arms is stilled. With the surrender of Lee at Appomattox began the march westward. In Lincoln's administration the national government had done two historic strokes of agrarian legislation. One act created the homestead and another the agricultural college. Men found, in the formula of the Homestead Act, passed in 1862, a practical way to get their part of the national domain. Parcels of land of one hundred and sixty acres were granted to the heads of families on condition of actual settlement. Previous experiments in disposing of the national domain had not succeeded, but this one offered to the possessor of land in the East better acres of virgin soil, fertile, level, free of rocks, and easily tilled. Between the date of the

passage of this act and 1890, over two hundred million acres were claimed as homesteads by the new settlers, and an area six times as large as New England had been peopled. In the early part of this period, from 1870 onward, extensive grants were made also to railroads, resulting in the projection of transcontinental lines. Whatever the wisdom or folly of these grants, they served to entice the settler westward. They broke up the complacency of household farming communities in the East. The idealism of a thousand years was unable to resist the call of the West. Hamlin Garland's[1] picture of his father describes the new and dominant type of farm migrant going always westward, fascinated by the prairies, looking for the mountains and dreaming of an unfulfilled hope. The force of this migration was irresistible. It was the one idea — "Pike's Peak or Bust," on a prairie schooner; "Go West, Young Man," on the editorial page of a great newspaper. For thirty years the whole people was in fact moving westward, or else in imagination regarding the migrant with envy and admiration. Eastern lands had no economic value. Those who stayed in the East were held upon their farms by the social friction of sentiment, kinship, or inertia. Like every other dominating idea, everybody talked it, though not all obeyed it. The older traditions still ruled the Eastern Colonial States, though the dissolving power of the westward passion freed the streams of talk, discussion, and unrest.

In 1867 the Grange, the National Patrons of Husbandry, was organized by civil employees in Washington. It became within five years a national institution. As long as the period of migration was on, it continued to

[1] *The Son of the Middle Border*, by Hamlin Garland. The Macmillan Co.

grow and to voice the discontent, the alarm and the craving for a new way of life. It provided in its organization the community meeting-place which still is an ideal in the mind of country people. It gave foresight, to farmers and to related economic types, of the time to come when country people would be organized by communities rather than by families. It experimented in almost everything that has been tried in the later years. It accumulated a body of knowledge which has been of priceless value to farmers in their attempts to organize and to legislate for self-expression.

There are still to be seen prairie schooners slowly creeping over the level lands west of the Mississippi. As many, perhaps more, are going eastward now as westward. But they do not dominate the thinking of people on the farms they pass or in the villages where they stop. Their day is done. About 1890 the free good lands in the national domain had all been granted. There was no longer fertile soil easy of tillage to compete with the colonial and southern farms. From this date on land has had a value, because all the land in the country requires investment of capital to make it productive. To describe land in terms of dollars was a new experience for Americans. Indeed it was an experience new to the world about the same time. The manor, like the household farm, was at first innocent of the thought of price. But now had come a time when every farm was for sale. The older ideals gave land almost a sacred valuation, but the farmer since 1890 is given to complacent expressions about the high price he has got or may ask for " eighty acres of dirt." We used to have in America a household farmer, but now we talk of "dirt farmers " and commend our wit for the expression.

Since 1890, in a progressive movement beginning in the northern Mississippi River basin, a wave of speculation in farm-land values has extended throughout the whole nation, until now every farmer in the country glibly tells how much he would take for his land. He knows by heart its price per acre. He would not in most cases, as a matter of fact, sell; but in all cases he thinks he would. Conservatism has a greater hold than men realize with each succeeding period, and the dominating ideas of previous periods hold minor rule; but the new idea has its supreme place. For the past thirty years the dominating idea in American farms has been money price. We hear about the money crop and we talk about land price. The eyes of all farmers in the most desired sections are fixed upon the market for the staple and the market price of the acre.

The beginning of this process was the drainage of lands in the states bordering on the Mississippi, especially Illinois and Indiana. Level fertile acres had before that time been cheap land, because in a wet season the crops were drowned in standing water. State and national government began extensive ditching operations. Huge canals were cut across the flat prairie. Rivers like the Wabash thereafter received through tile drains the waters of a summer rain in a few hours. Great crops of corn grew unhindered by wet weather. The price of Middle Western lands began to rise from $25 an acre by successive swift increases to $75 and $100 per acre. They have gone up until there seems no limit to the value put upon them. During the Great War a frenzy of speculation at times possessed the farmers and villagers of Illinois, Iowa, and Kansas.

This movement extended eastward as well as north,

west and southwest. In the years succeeding the World War, western farmers, still wearing their broad, flat-brimmed hats, are buying farms in central New York with the avowed purpose of living upon them a few years, selling them and moving on. When they move, they go eastward. Ten years ago this type of farm speculator lived in the middle of Ohio. His arrival heralds a hundred per cent increase in farm prices.

It was natural that with the maturing of an American population, the exploitation of the natural resources should come. We have exploited the forest, removing the timber from the hills and making out of its vast resources a few fortunes. We wasted in the process nine-tenths, for every one-tenth of wealth accumulated by the exploiter. We have exploited the coal and iron and other minerals. The exploitation of the oil deposits and natural gas reservoirs has been a national experience and a national scandal. The tendency to exploit every opportunity for private wealth has characterized the past two decades.[2]

There are those who exploit the farm. "Farms which from the original entry until 1890 had been owned by the same family, or which had changed owners but once or twice, and whose owners were proud to assert that their broad acres had never been encumbered with mortgages, since 1890 have been sold, in some instances four or five times, and a large part of the purchase price is secured by encumbering the estates!"[3]

Agriculture, especially of the Middle West, is affected in all its parts by the exploitation of land. To a traveler from the Eastern States, the selling and re-selling of

[2] *The Conservation of Natural Resources in the United States*, by Van Hise.

[3] *Agrarian Changes in the Middle West*, by J. B. Ross.

farm land, without fertilization or improvement by the successive owners, is a source of amazement.

"The new lands opened under the Homestead Act of half a century ago were often exploited for temporary profit by soil robbers who were experts of their kind. Owing to such farm management, the yield of the acre in the United States gradually decreased."[4]

The commercial exploitation of land dissolves every permanent factor in the farm economy. The country community of the household-farmer type is being undermined and is crumbling away under the influence of exploitation. The pioneers in westward emigration pushed westward the boundaries of the country at the rate of fifty miles in a decade; but since 1890 emigration has been eastward also. It is made up of farmers who move to ever cheaper and cheaper lands to the East, the tide of higher prices coming from the West. It is not generally understood that this exploitation of farm lands has extended over nearly the whole country.

The sign of this exploitation is a rapid increase in the market prices of farm land, with frequent sale and purchase. This increase is independent of any increase in value to the farmer. The net income of the farmer may have been increased only five per cent, as in the State of Indiana in 1900–1910, whereas the values of farm land had increased in the same period more than one hundred per cent. That is, the speculative increases were twenty times as much as the agricultural increase.

The essential process of exploitation is that by which farms are sold for more than their production, or the profit upon them, will justify. Farms in the most

[4] Secretary of Agriculture, James Wilson, at the United States Land and Irrigation Exposition, Chicago, Nov. 19, 1910.

desired sections of Illinois and Iowa have been sold in recent years for $400 and $600 per acre. Many of them are not producing and have never produced enough to furnish their owners with a profit of more than one to three per cent upon this investment. The process by which they get so high a valuation is one of pure speculation. It is a financial, not an agricultural process, though it is carried on mostly by men who were farmers. Some of them still are farm operators as well as speculators. This process is measured by the disproportion between the increased price at which land is sold, and the increased production or profit. An old farmer said to the writer, "In 1890 my farm produced 95 bushels of corn per acre. At that time it was worth $75 per acre. Now in my maturer years I can raise only 49 bushels, but my land would sell for $175 per acre." In this instance, which is representative, the increased selling price was accompanied by a diminished production. During the years in question there had been no increase in price of corn, so that the farmer's profit was less, whereas the price upon his land was more.

The causes of the higher prices of land are, first, the general realization that there is no good free land to be had. Since 1890 a great change has come over the minds of those who before that time cherished the thought that "Uncle Sam can give us all a farm." The same feelings of land hunger now work toward higher prices which formerly led men to think of moving westward. Second: the growth of cities has directly stimulated land prices, as congestion of population always does. Around each city has grown up a speculated area in which land is too dear to be profitably farmed. The third cause is the intervention of the government since 1890 in putting

certain lands on the market by artificial measures. The drainage of the flat prairie lands of the Middle West was a government measure; the reclamation of swamp lands in parts of the South; the irrigation of western arid lands — these have all put into the market lands of high intrinsic value. These movements have been attended with speculative interest which has greatly magnified the value of land or, more correctly speaking, has standardized the prices at the maximum value of any land so improved. Thus, in the Middle West farmers pay $200 or $300 per acre for farms, only a few of which pay interest under the best of management upon such an investment. A price of $1,000 per acre for California fruit land, or $300 per acre for black muck in New York State, is one on which a few can get returns, but which all are willing to pay under speculative selling.

In general, the prices of land increased between 1900 and 1910 by 118.1 per cent. Contrasting this with the increase in the value of implements and machinery, 61.7 per cent, and with the increase in the value of farm buildings, 77.8 per cent, and with the increase in the value of farm animals, 60.1 per cent, it is evident that the price of land was affected by something else than productive improvement. The ratio of increase in the price of farm land is far beyond that in the increase of other farm properties. Men desired land, so far as their desire can be measured in terms of money, more than they desired buildings or horses or cattle.

Along with this change in farm values goes the increase or decrease in the number of tenant farmers and the shifting of the ownership of land to farm landlords. In some parts of the country this exploitation has taken

a purely speculative form. In all parts it is speculative in character. In most sections of the country the exploiters are themselves farmers and the process is imposed upon the farmers themselves by economic causes. This is true of the Illinois and Indiana lands, which are under the influence of a system of drainage and of a regional industrial development; but there are other portions of the country in which the process is chiefly speculative. In some western states the exploitation of farm land is in the hands of speculators themselves, who do real estate business purely as a matter of trade. It would be a mistake, however, to attribute a process so general as this one to the power exerted by a class of real estate agents. Its causes are deeper than the commercial process. They go into the very roots of modern life. This should be clearly understood, because when frankly realized it compels the adjustment of social, educational, and religious work to the period of exploitation.

With the speculation in farm land have appeared new types of farmer. The process creates its own social forms as it goes along. The first of these is the retired farmer. Twenty years ago the Middle West made a wry face over him, now eastern Pennsylvania is astonished to find him camped in her village streets. This man took money for his farm and committed himself for the remainder of his years to the career of small capitalist. There were often good reasons for the individual selling his farm. Chief among them was usually the desire to educate his children, in the face of an unimproved country school. Sometimes the motive for moving to town was a desire of the women of the family for more social life. Frequently it was the rest-

lessness of the children. Too often the farmer sold at fifty or sixty years of age because his sons and daughters had gone into other occupations and would not return. The economic forces to which he has submitted make of him a new type, characteristic of small cities. The civic policies of hundreds of towns and municipalities are controlled in a measure by retired farmers; so that journalists, novelists, religious leaders, reformers, and politicians have very clear-cut opinions as to the value of the retired farmer.

But whatever the motive or the cause, and whatever the social success of the move, the farmer who on a rising market sold and retired to town has made an economic mistake. The money which he received for his land has a diminishing value. Interest rates until the World War were falling and his income was diminishing. Meantime, his wants increased; those of his wife and daughter multiplied; while a lessened income proved insufficient to meet them. Public improvements in the village or town demanded his support. Improvers of the streets, of the schools, and of the churches were not slow to criticize his reluctance to contribute or to pay taxes. He found himself an unpopular kind of man. Most of all his discomfiture was completed by the selling of the old farm for an ever higher price. So that the retired farmer has been an unhappy and a disappointed man in the town to which he has retired. In a town which is rapidly being socialized, he is made to feel that he is anti-social.

Many retired farmers are landlords. They have not sold but rented their farms. Their diminished income has put them in the same class as the retired farmer just described, but they have a standing of their own.

The American landlord in the period of speculation since 1890 is concerned chiefly with the possibility of selling his farm. He rents it therefore as a rule to a one-year tenant. His own concern is with the fences he builds and the possibility of a buyer. He is not a responsible landlord in the sections where active exploitation has been going on, but rather a trader watching for his chance of a price. He is too often the opponent of improvement of schools. In some instances he has attempted to force his tenants to oppose the consolidation of schools which their children greatly need, his motive being to avoid increased taxation for improvements in which he has no personal interest. Progressive citizens are not slow to proclaim him an obstacle to progress.

The American farm tenant has increased in numbers and in proportion to the increase of the population since 1880 when the proportion of tenants was one fourth or more, — to be precise 25.6 per cent of the rural population. In 1890 the tenants were 28.4 per cent; in 1900, 35.3 per cent; in 1910, 37 per cent; in 1920, 38.1 per cent. This increase has been more rapid than that of the farm owners and it was greatest in the East South Central, West South Central, and Mountain States. In general tenants increased in the farms operating the richest, most fertile lands, while in the poorer sections the owner outstrips the tenant in his proportionate increase.

Along with this increase in tenantry has gone a postponement of the age of acquiring land. In 1890 farmers paid for their land at 29 years of age, but in 1915 the average age at which farmers acquired land was 34; that is, six years had been added to the age of acquiring land

in a quarter of a century. Vogt[5] says that all types of farming except fruit growing show increase in farm tenantry. The American farm tenants have fewer cattle than the operating owners. As a rule their standard of living is lower, the enjoyment of household comforts is not theirs in the same degree as the owners. They do not educate their children as thoroughly, and in general the renters are forced to accept a lower status and an inferior share in the social wealth of the community.

Corresponding to this increase in farm tenancy is a rapid rise in the price of farm land. In the first decade of this century the farmers made comfortable increases in the classes of farm property on which their thrift or industry could register themselves. Domestic animals increased 60.1 per cent, implements and machinery 61.7 per cent, buildings 77.8 per cent. The land price increased in the same period 118.1 per cent. Even the general increase of all farm property for all that period was only 100.5 per cent. The ten years named were a period of solid development of a farm population nearly static. For while the general population increased 21 per cent, the number of farmers and of farms increased only 11 per cent and farm products increased only 10 per cent. The product of the average acre increased not at all and the average acreage per farm decreased 6 per cent. These figures show a readjustment between 1900 and 1910 in which the increase of farm tenancy is only one of the measurements.

Other measures of adjustment in that time show that owners increased 8.1 per cent in number. Managers decreased 1.7 per cent, but tenants increased 16.3 per

[5] See *Introduction to Rural Sociology*, by Paul L. Vogt, University of Chicago Press, which has details of interest concerning the social condition of tenants.

cent, while the type of tenant known as a share tenant increased 20 per cent, and that form of renting known as "owner renting additional land," increased 31.6 per cent.

The census shows, however, that the increase in farm tenancy is not as great in the decade of the World War as in any one of the preceding three decades. The farms operated by owners in 1920 comprised 60.9 per cent of the total number: farms operated by managers 1.1 per cent; and farms operated by tenants 38.1 per cent. In 1910, 37 per cent of all farms were operated by tenants; 1900, 35.3 per cent; in 1890, 38.4 per cent; in 1880 25.6 per cent. It thus appears that while the percentage of farms operated by tenants has increased during the last decade, the increase is not so great as that shown in any of the earlier decades for which figures are available.[6] This showing, which is surprising and gratifying because it comes at a period of agrarian strain, would indicate on its face that the farm-owner is holding his own in the race for land and the farm tenant is ceasing to gain upon him. The rate of increase of farm tenancy is less than in any previous decade of which we have record. Every form of tenancy except share-tenancy lost instead of gained, including that type known as "hiring additional land." Share-tenants increased 19.9 per cent — in the previous decade 20 per cent; share-cash tenants decreased 0.5 per cent; cash tenants decreased 17.9 per cent; unspecified tenants 44.6 per cent; owners hiring additional land decreased 5.9 per cent. It is true that the farm-owners lost 0.6 per cent but then the whole number of farms gained only 1.4 per cent in the decade of the World War.

[6] Fourteenth Census, 1920.

The real gains in that period are in the number of share-tenants, 19.9 per cent and in the number of managers. In the previous decade the proportion of managers decreased 1.7 per cent; but from 1910 to 1920 it increased 5.7 per cent; so that we may perhaps suppose that the conditions of war increased the proportion of those two forms of tenure in which the owner receives the products of the land to market as he pleases. The increase in the number of managers may be peculiar to the war period, because of the possibilities of wholesale production during that time. Some of these questions, however, await more detailed analysis of the census figures in the light of contemporary history. As this is a study of exploitation it may be well to quote the Fourteenth Census further.

"The total farm acreage was distributed by tenants in 1920 as follows: Owners 66.6 per cent; managers 5.7 per cent; and tenants 27.7 per cent. It is apparent, therefore, that on the basis of acreage the relative importance of farms operated by owners and managers is considerably greater than the mere number of farms would indicate." From the broadest consideration of the census of 1920, therefore, we are inclined to hope that farm exploitation, as measured by tenancy and landlordism, has been checked. Perhaps we may look for a more stable agriculture. We have looked for the dawn of husbandry about this time. The redistribution of land cannot go on forever. When the full history of the post-war period is written it may appear that the application of science to agriculture and the cooperative organization of it, foreseen in the first decade of this century by Ross, Plunkett, Roosevelt and Bailey, have

produced by the third decade a mature and permanent husbandry.

The American farm tenant, with distinguished exceptions, is on a one-year lease. We Americans, who have deplored for over a century the ill condition of the European peasant, are ourselves nourishing a social type not only dependent but dangerous. For the one-year lease compels the renter of the land to exploit it. Of necessity he plants the crop, and generally one crop only, which will bring him the highest cash return. He will get more out of the best land than an owner would because he has no industrial conscience. The exploiting landlord wants his rent and the tenant must have his living. Neither of them is concerned with the future of the land and both of them would be surprised at any expression of solicitude for the land. They would tell you that its price is going up and ask what more you want.

The tenant is, in some sections where a conservative tillage of the soil has remained from earlier times, in possession of the land for more than one year. In northwestern Missouri, in parts of Maryland, Delaware and Virginia, and in western New York are representative areas in which tenants have a three- or five-year lease upon the land. I am aware, also, that in Delaware, in an old section dependent upon fertilization for its crops, where the land is in the hands of a few representatives of the old farmer type who have held it for generations, the tillage of the soil shows specialization. The landlord and the tenant cooperate. The leases, while they are for but a year, specify how the land shall be tilled, how fertilized. They require the rotation of crops and the keeping of a certain number of cattle by the tenants.

The landlord personally oversees the tillage of several farms. This seems to be the beginning of husbandry instead of exploitation of the land. There is even in central Illinois, where exploiting is at its highest, such good judgment among many farmers of conservative type that frequent instances occur of tenants who have been on the same farm for a decade or a lifetime. As in other periods of farm development, the older order still has power to rule the minds and actions of men. But the dominance of the speculative ideal works evil in the whole population. The alarming factor in the situation is the fact that there is no general requirement in law designed for the regulation of tenancy or to protect the soil on which future generations depend. There is no protection for the tenant in his development of a solid, responsible family life. The state does nothing to conserve the responsible relationship of the landlord to the soil. Instances of long-term tenancy are only individual instances explainable by conservatism of race, religion, or accidental circumstance. We are not building either acres or men in our exploited farm communities.

The tenant farmer requires a definite service on the part of the school, which the farm owner does not. The children of a tenant usually have a home inferior in furnishings and deficient in privileges, too often lacking in inspiring traditions. They need a school which is stronger in its power of idealization, taught by an abler teacher and organized for a more definite service, than the children of farm owners need. What the household lacks the school must in certain particulars supply. The life of a farm tenant and of his wife is strenuous and exacting. By incessant toil and economy they must save enough to secure land of their own. They have to

provide, even if they do not get ahead, for the living of two families out of the soil they till. This hard work leaves them little time or opportunity for training their children, and the teacher must do what the parent cannot do.

Vocational training is very necessary for the children of tenants, because they must take up with little capital the task of farm labor and carry it on in the second generation, or else find themselves in the industrial world away from the farm. The consolidated school with its possibility of teaching agriculture and home economics is most needed in a farm-renting community. Musical and artistic training must be supplied by the school if they are to be enjoyed by the people. Teachers are needed for such a community both better selected and more highly specialized in order that the school may strengthen the children of the renter's family for the severe economic and social struggle with which they are confronted.

The effect of farm exploitation on social institutions is to destroy some of them and to retard them generally. Wherever landlords and retired farmers have appeared in numbers the schools have stood still, unless they had prior to the period of exploitation begun to protect themselves by wise and foresighted laws. The one-teacher school is regarded by the landlord as good enough for his tenants. Progress in supervision of schools is opposed to the interests of a farm exploiter. In like manner the church in the exploited sections of the country gets no advance. The newcomers in the country who have bought farms or rented them know nothing of the early days of the church so dear to its members and they fail to support it.

The exploitation of land has built no community. It has contributed the retired farmer to the large towns and small cities of the Middle West. It is natural, therefore, that few exploiter churches are found in the country.

But not all the farm exploiters retired from the farm. The stronger and more successful have become absentee landlords. These men have invested their cash in farm lands. Distrusting the investments of the city market, and fearing Wall Street, they have purchased increased acreage in the country, and when the local market was exhausted, they have invested in the Southwest and the far West, buying ever more and more land. They have proven that "It is possible to maintain a vicious economic method on a rising market."[7]

These landlords have leased their land in accordance with mere expediency. No plans having been made in the American rural economy for a tenantry, the lease throughout the United States generally is for only one year. This gives to the landlord the greatest freedom, and to the tenant the least responsibility. Neither is willing to enter into a contract by which the land itself can be benefitted. The landlord is looking for the increase of the prices of land, and is ever mindful of a possible buyer. Moreover, he is watchful of the market for the crop and of the size of the crop, so that he desires to be free at the end of the year to make other arrangements.

The earlier American communities were the expression of a status slowly developed, which exploitation destroys. The modern American community has gone through a "redistribution of land." It is dynamic

[7] *The Rural Life Problem in the United States*, by Sir Horace Plunkett.

rather than static. Its institutions must be readjusted to the process going on about them. The older one-teacher school and a single-cell church are both comfortable institutions for a population that has neither been diminished by the removal of the earlier owners nor chilled by the pouring in of strange families.

As most rural churches are Protestant and independent of one another, there is no tradition to hand on and no authority to command the newcomers. The ministers change. New parsons come into the community as preachers only and are without sympathy with the past of the church. Thus in one decade the life of a church may be destroyed. Worse than all, by the process of exploitation new churches are introduced, for the chances are that the buyers of land or the renters will desire another denomination than the one supported by the former owners. So the community is religiously divided.

The lodges and social clubs of an exploited community suffer in the same manner. A community is made up of an interacting group of persons who know one another and through a generation or two have attained a working interaction. The probability is that they have intermarried and have learned to depend upon kinship and friendship for motives as well as upon trading advantage. Exploitation removes friend from friend and separates kinsmen. Strangers care nothing for the local community even though they "have bought into it."

In some sections of the country the exploitation of land leads to a new husbandry. Perhaps it would be better to say that exploitation clears the ground for social control of the land by the world economy. Scientific agricultural teaching comes to the farmer from the

universities. Cooperative organization is an experience of farmers in other countries. It is communicated from one nation to another in impulses which pass across the seas. New wants are felt by farmers in the period of husbandry that is beginning in America, the same wants that European farmers feel. Inventors have set new standards for farmers in the machines and the processes they have devised which the husbandman uses. These four forces, therefore, education, cooperation, economic want, and farm machinery, have moulded for themselves a new type of farmer. He could not have been made out of the old farm stock if a stronger force than persuasion had not come. That force was exploitation of land. The prejudices of the household farmer were broken down. His reluctance and inertia were started into new channels by the wants of the exploiter. His hope was turned by the possession of money. He or his kinsmen retired to the town as small capitalists or landlords. There he learned ways he never could have acquired on a homestead. The whole farm population was mobilized by the redistribution of land, excited by higher prices, alarmed by appreciation of the power of cities and the men who dwell in them, and made in the end to idealize the life in the country, so that they were willing to study it. It was said in 1890 that "farmers cannot learn to cooperate." From city people they learned the necessity of combining. The teacher of appreciation of agricultural science was the exploiter.

During the period of exploitation the agricultural colleges came into their own. Founded much earlier they got no hearing from the household farmer. The migrant had no time for them. Only in the latter period of exploitation, when the son of the farmer meets in the

agricultural college the boy and girl from the city, does he realize by contrast and by comparison how great are the possibilities of agriculture. The higher prices of farm lands have forced farmers to study the prices of farm products and to give attention to the outreaching science of farm economics. The value of the tractor in comparison with the horse, the profits made from a milking machine contrasted with those made by hand milkers, have been studied for two decades by farm operators. After about twenty years of the popular education furnished by the process of farm speculation, therefore, a man who owns or who works a farm is a fair economist. He knows what he wants in terms of the profit to be had. Indeed, it is amazing to observe that the hard-headed farmer has often thought his position out in terms of expediency before the college professor has arrived at the same conclusion by analysis and by induction.

Above all, the period of exploitation must be understood by the teacher and the preacher to be a preparation, a transition through which country people are coming to organized and scientific agriculture. Gradually the influence of science and the leadership of the departments and colleges of agriculture are being extended in the country. Little by little, whether through landlord or tenant, farming is becoming a profession requiring brains, science, and trained intelligence. The schools will change in conformity with the type of social life, as they always do. They are already changing. The consolidated country school is an agency of world ideas as the one-room school was a servant of the farm household. Teachers and friends of rural educa-

tion should study the world changes going on and adapt the school to the times.

The country church should promote this process because only through its maturity can the country church in the average community find its own establishment. The reconstruction of the churches now going on corresponds to the exploitation of the land. The duty of the church in the process of exploitation is to build the community and to make itself the center of the growing scientific industry on which the country community in the future will be founded.

The religion of the exploiter moves in the giving of money. Consecration of his wealth is consecration of his world and of himself. The church that would save him must teach him to give. His sins are those of greed, his virtues are those of benevolence. His own type, not the least worthy among men, should be honored in his religion. No man's conversion ever makes him depart from his type; it makes him be true to his type. Therefore the religion for the exploiter of land is a religion of giving, to the poor at his door, to the ignorant in this land, and to the needy of all lands.

There are in the larger cities churches whose business is to give; Sunday after Sunday they hear pleas and consider the cases of college presidents, superintendents of charities, secretaries of mission boards and other official solicitors. These churches have systematized the discipline of giving. Their boards of officers control the appeals that shall be made to their people. Such churches are highly individualistic in character. The preacher who ministers in such a church has a doctrine of individual culture and responsibility. The exploiter's doctrine of systematic giving has gone into all of the

communities in which prosperous people live. It has become a moral code for millionaires, and the response to it is annually measured in the great gifts of men of large means to institutions which exist for the use of all mankind.

Exploiting has taught the farmer to do business. It is a primary school in credit, loans, capital, investment, depreciation, and market price. It has converted him in thirty years from the well-meaning religious dreamer and argufier of the nineties to the shrewd, resolute cooperator of the present; who is often member of a federal farm loan bank and officer of a produce exchange. He was religious then and devoted to education — but he refused to improve either church or school because he had not the money. Now he is absorbed in the business side of farming, indifferent to theology, eager for relaxation, and not averse to pleasure. He has a conviction that money secured from enhanced value of land belongs in land, not in social properties. He thinks his speculative gains are his own, not the community's. The experience of exploitation has schooled our generation in the knowledge that the community must look for its improvements not to the farmers' land price, but to the farmers' labor income.

When the prices of land in a community go up, the farmers either sell or stay. Those who sell as a rule go elsewhere; and even if they buy near by, or retire to town, their will to serve the community is broken. The school loses their ardent support if they remain, for their mind is upon speculation, not education. If they move away, they are lost. A stranger moves in, perhaps a tenant, who requires a period of time to adjust himself. So far as the local church goes, the chances are that he

prefers another of the Protestant varieties. When a speculative rise in price of land inundates a community all at once, as it usually does, and many farms are sold in a year or two, the effect is disastrous. The personnel of all community boards and committees is changed. Strangers come, who need socialization, but there are fewer neighbors to welcome them, to introduce them and initiate them.

At such a time pastors change, social halls are closed or fall into the hands of the projectors of cheap dances for money; schools lose their best teachers, the public health nurse goes and no other is secured. After prices are adjusted — "you would not know the town — it is so different."

But the enhanced values, or rather prices, increase the wealth of the farmers who remain. Now of what use is this to an operating farmer? Of no use except for the purpose of borrowing money. He can go to the money lender and secure a larger loan. Such a time is indeed the best for a farmer to "stock up," to buy better machinery, to drain land and improve his productive property. Indeed there are the best of reasons why he should borrow money for improvement of his property. His income will be increased as his invested capital, owned or borrowed, it does not matter which, is increased. If his income increases he will not be tempted to sell. So the community — which lives in permanency — is benefitted by the higher land price; provided, of course, he does borrow and improve his productive property.

But the school or church or community house may have none of the borrowed money. The lender becomes potential owner and is interested to see this borrowed

money put into improvement of the property itself. To use it for community improvement would be, except in dire emergency, neither economic nor ethical. Both thrift and morality oppose it. Effectively too, for in all the sections when land price has since 1890 so steadily gone up, it is the rule for the farmers to stock up their farms but to refuse community contributions. "I have driven fifty miles this morning," wrote a social survey worker in northern Missouri, "and I have seen better cattle, silos, drainage ditches everywhere, new barns, modern machinery on every farm, but nowhere an improved church or school; and the public roads are awful!" This was written just after the price of land had increased one hundred per cent in that county. Of course it might be claimed that schools or churches should be regarded as productive improvements; but not these Missouri schools or churches. These Missouri farmers "would have to be shown." No educational or religious adjustment has yet been made to demonstrate it.

IV

THE HUSBANDMAN

It is not easy to find a name for the new farmer. The types that have preceded him are described in our common talk. But his mode of life is only beginning to be recognized. It is still a matter of faith more often than fact. Chief among doubters has been the farmer himself, who has little historical perspective. He does not see the processes by which in orderly sequence agriculture in America has rooted itself in the soil, reproduced itself in a multitude of uniform groups and evolved from one form of social life to another. Indeed, no one has until the past twenty years recognized that there is a history of agriculture. No text-book upon it has yet appeared.

In these pages we will call the culminating American type of farmer the husbandman. He would not use this term himself. It is too academic and poetical for any but a student or a man of faith to use. But the readers of these pages are both students and believers, — students, because we think of country life in terms of its historical development; believers, because we idealize the country community and are confident of its permanent future.

Another difficulty in describing the mature farm community is in the fact that it is not so simple as those that precede it. Agrarian life is cumulative. It proceeds by development from the simpler to the more

complex. But the earlier forms continue when the later have come into existence, so that in the modern communities one is pretty sure to find individuals and families who conform to the earlier types. The community of husbandmen, therefore, will have in its membership pioneers, household farmers and exploiters, each acting his own part. Life is not so simple as it was in the day when these worthies dominated their communities. Every public movement must go by persuasion and conviction. The husbandman dominates his community no less than the household farmer did. But he has a harder task. He does not effect his rule by giving orders; nor even by example. He must employ complicated propaganda and expert service to extend his dominion over his neighbors. Furthermore, he is conscious, as they were not, of his relation to the community and to the commonwealth. His eyes have been opened. What they did by instinct and by the vegetable growth of tradition he aspires to do by intellectual analysis and ethical appeal. He has ideas that were unknown to them. Besides the idea of the community, which has grown very rapidly since the first edition of this book was published, he has the conception of a world society. The experience of selling his goods in a market of which Liverpool is the market-place has caused him to think well of the farmers of the whole world. His sympathies have been greatly broadened; his outlook unbelievably extended. His ideals arise in his mind in obedience to necessities his father did not feel.

Nevertheless, the husbandmen community is dominated by the husbandman. As in the beginning we said that one idea rules the American mind, so now it is to be noted that the domination of the farmer in his field

of life is in an idea which for the time-being we can call "husbandry." Those who have it in the town and country about are the leaders. Their dominion is no less effective because it is questioned and disputed. Discussion and propaganda are the very breath of their social life, as imitation and loyalty were the forms of leadership in the pioneer day.

The scientific farmer is dependent upon the world economy. He is the local representative of agriculture, whose organization is national and even international. He raises cotton in Georgia, but he "makes milk" in Orange County, New York, because the market, the soil, the climate, and other conditions require of him this crop.

He is dependent upon the college of agriculture and upon the county agent for the methods by which he can survive as a farmer. Tradition, which dominated the agriculture of a former period, is a disappearing factor in husbandry of the soil. The changes in market conditions are such as to impoverish the farmer who learns only from the past. Tradition could teach the farmer how to raise the raw materials, under the old economy in which the farmhouse and community were sufficient unto themselves. But in a time when the wool of Australia goes half-way round the world in its passage from the back of a sheep to the back of a man, the shepherd becomes dependent upon the scientist. He cannot afford to raise sheep unless the scientific man assures him that in the production of wool his land has its highest utility. "The American farm land is passing into the hands of those who will use it to the highest advantage."[1]

[1] *Rural Economics*, by Thomas Nixon. Carver. Ginn & Co.

The dependence of the scientific farmer or husbandman upon the world market and upon the scientists who are studying agriculture enlarges the circle of his life from the rural household to the rural community. In the rural community agriculture can be taught; in the household it cannot. The only teaching of the household is tradition; the teaching of the community is in terms of science. The country school and the country church take a greater place as community institutions just so soon as the farmer passes out of the period of exploitation into that of scientific husbandry.

The beginnings of husbandry have been connected with the development of a type of education all its own. The county agent in agriculture is a creation of the past twenty years. Under the leadership of Dr. Seaman Knapp[2] demonstration work was begun in Texas, with the purpose of combating the boll weevil, a foe of the cotton crop. It extended so rapidly that in 1914 the United States Congress passed the Smith-Lever Act, making adequate provision for a county agent in every state of the Union, under definite conditions of cooperation between state and Union. The county agent has in most states associated with himself leading farmers in a Farm Bureau. These Farm Bureaus have created a national organization called the Federation of Farm Bureaus, which is a potent champion of the farmer in Washington.

The husbandman community has usually been characterized by mutual support. Indeed, the conception of the community has grown in the period of husbandry in the minds of men. Farmers are too hard-headed to

[2] *The Demonstration Work*, by O. B. Martin, is a story of Seaman Knapp's work, by one of his lieutenants, with analysis of the principles and methods employed.

commit themselves to anything theoretic, yet they obey this conception in their organization.

The mark of communal husbandry is plasticity. The husbandman is the man among farmers who is willing to change. Every one testifies to the leadership of the "best families" in the transformation from the older tillage to the newer. It is impossible for the scientific agriculturist to make much improvement upon a country community until the more progressive spirits and the more open minds have been enlisted. Thereafter the better farming problem is solved. There can be no modern agriculture in a community in which all are equal. The communities of husbandmen will be as sharply differentiated from one another, so far as I can see, as men are in the great cities. Leadership is the essential of progress. Gabriel Tarde has clearly demonstrated that only those who are at the top of the social scale can initiate social and economic enterprises. The cultivation of the soil for generations to come must be highly progressive. To recover what we have lost and to restore what has been wasted will exhaust the resources of science and will tax the intelligence of the leaders among husbandmen.

For this reason the ministers, teachers, and social workers in the country should be not discouraged but hopeful when confronted with rural landlords and absentee, exploiting capitalists. The business of the community leader is to enlist in the common task those persons whose privileges are superior and to inspire them with a progressive spirit. Without their leadership the community cannot progress. Without their privileges, wealth, and superior education, no progress is possible in the country.

If these pages tell the truth, then agriculture is a mode of life fertile in religious and ethical values. But it must be husbandry, not exploitation. Religious farming is a lifelong agriculture, indeed, it involves generations, and its serious, devoted spirit waits for the reward, which was planted by the diligent father or grandfather, to be reaped by the son or grandson. Men will not so consecrate themselves to their children's good without the steadying influence of religion. Agriculture and religion are each the cause, and each the effect, of the other.

If this is true, then the country church should promote the husbandry of the soil. The agricultural college should be brought into the country parish, for the church's sake. Indeed, the minister would do well if his scholarship be the learning of the husbandman. No other science has such religious values. No other books have such immediate relation to the well-being of the people.

Husbandry is necessary for those who undertake the tillage of second-grade land. The first-class land of the country has been appropriated and some of it has been exhausted, making necessary in days to come the most careful and scientific treatment of soils. The utilization of second- and third-class land has given rise to problems — reclamation, irrigation, drainage, dry farming; and corresponding to these has been an increase in the use, by the average farmer, of scientific methods whereby he may cultivate lands which his grandfather would have counted worthless. Husbandry, defined as social control in agriculture, means the utilization by society, through the farmer, of grades of land which can

only be cultivated and made productive through scientific knowledge and cooperative action.

The husbandman or rural economist cares more for qualities than for quantity. He works not merely for intensive cultivation of the soil, but also for the preservation of the soil and use of it in its own terms, at its highest values.

The principle at work is not the increase in the farmer's material gains or possessions. The husbandry of the soil is not a mere increase in market values. It is a deeper and more ethical welfare than that which can be put in the bank. "Agriculture is a religious occupation." When it sustains a permanent population and extends from generation to generation the same experiences, agriculture is productive in the highest degree of moral and religious values. In the words of L. H. Bailey, "The land is holy."

This is especially true at the present time, when the land is limited in amount. Already the whole nation is dependent upon the farmer in the degree intimated by the statement of Dean Bailey. "The census of 1900 showed approximately one-third of our people on farms or closely connected with farms, as against something like nine-tenths, a hundred years previous. It is doubtful whether we have struck bottom, although the rural exodus may have gone too far in some regions, and we may not permanently strike bottom for some time to come."[3]

The service of the few to the many, therefore, is the present function of the husbandman. The very fact that one-third of the people must feed all the people imposes religious and ethical conditions upon the farmer.

[3] *The Country-Life Movement*, by L. H. Bailey.

The dependence of the greater number for their welfare upon those who are to till the soil brings that obligation, which the farmer is well constituted to bear and to which his serious spirit gives response.

This means that with the growing consciousness of the need of scientific agriculture there will arise, indeed is now arising, a new ethical and religious feeling among country people. The church which is made up of scientific farmers is a new type of church.

A notable testimony to the influence of religion in developing husbandry is by Sir Horace Plunkett,[4] who testifies to the religious influence that led to the agrarian revolution in Denmark.

"My friends and I have been deeply impressed by the educational experience of Denmark, where the people, who are as much dependent on agriculture as are the Irish, have brought it by means of organization to a more genuine success than it has attained anywhere else in Europe. Yet an inquirer will at once discover that it is to the 'High School' founded by Bishop Grundtvig, and not to the agricultural schools, which are also excellent, that the extraordinary national progesss is mainly due. A friend of mine who was studying the Danish system of state aid to agriculture, found this to be the opinion of the Danes of all classes, and was astounded at the achievements of the associations of farmers not only in the manufacture of butter, but in a far more difficult undertaking, the manufacture of bacon in large factories equipped with all the most modern machinery and appliances which science had devised for the production of the finished article. He at first concluded that this success in a highly technical industry

[4] *Ireland in the New Century*, by Sir Horace Plunkett.

by bodies of farmers indicated a very perfect system of technical education. But he soon found another cause. As one of the leading educators and agriculturists of the country put it to him: 'It's not technical instruction, it's the humanities.' I would like to add that it is also, if I may coin a term, the 'nationalities,' for nothing is more evident to the student of Danish education or, I might add, of the excellent system of the Christian Brothers in Ireland, than that one of the secrets of their success is to be found in their national basis and their foundation upon the history and literature of the country."

Every observer of these Danish Folk High Schools testifies to their religious enthusiasm, their patriotism, and above all to the songs with which their lecture hours are begun and ended. A graduate of these schools, living for years in America, the mother of children then entering college, said, "Those songs helped me over the hardest period of my life. I can always sing myself happy with them." The spirit which pervades the schools was influential in Danish agriculture, as expressed in the title of Grundtvig's best known hymn, "The Country Church Bells." Under such an influence as this, the agricultural life of Denmark has taken the lead over its urban and manufacturing life.

The modifying influence of husbandry upon the church and its teaching is illustrated in the following incident. A farmer in Missouri had a good stand of corn which promised all through the summer to produce an excellent crop. Abundance of sun and rain favored the farmer's hope that his returns would be large, but in the fall the crop proved a failure. The farmer at once cast about for the cause of this disappointment.

He had his soil analyzed by a scientist and discovered that it was deficient in nitrogen. The next year he devoted to supplying this lack in the soil and in the year following had an abundant return in corn. "That experience turned me away," said he, "from the country church, because the teaching of the country church as I had been accustomed to it was out of harmony with the study of the situation and the conquest over nature. I had been taught in the country church to surrender under such conditions to the will of Providence." The country church of the husbandman must therefore be a church intelligent as to the tillage of the soil. Like the farm households about it, the church will possess a large wealth of tradition, but the church of the scientific farmer must also be open to the teachings of science and must be responsive, intelligent, and alert in the intellectual leadership of the people.

There are a few ministers throughout the country who are successful farmers. Some ministers are speculators in farm land. They belong in the exploiter class. One preacher who promotes agriculture was asked, "Do you then believe that the minister should attend the agricultural college?" and he replied, "No. The agricultural college should be brought to the country church."

The farmer's pastor must grow up with the country. Long years of service are the rule among those ministers who have effectually led their people in productive Christianity and organized permanent farm communities. The pastor of the Little Britain Presbyterian Church in New York, Rev. J. Scott King, D.D., has been more than twenty years in that church. Furnished with good country sense to begin with, he has studied dairy farming as a scholar and equipped himself as a lecturer

and teacher through the Grange. His people have learned to seek his advice upon all agricultural problems, sometimes to a degree that has embarrassed their pastor. It is easier for a man in a country not to know much about farming. But the honors and distinctions given to the well-informed country pastor are such as any man who loves the soul of man would crave. Two farmers came to Dr. King with the request that he serve as umpire in determining a boundary dispute. The pastor of the parish accepted and accompanied the two surveyors on their trip around the farm; his decision as to disputed bounds being accepted by both parties as final. Every duty that could fall to the employed agent of the community if he were a representative of the farmers has fallen to Dr. King, from securing horse-shed privileges in the city near at hand to assembling the farmers for the charitable work of harvesting a sick man's crop. It would seem as if every country minister should be trusted in these ways, but how strongly Dr. King's pastorate stands out in contrast to that of the average country minister!

The institutions of a community of husbandmen are still few. Country life is characterized by an insufficient supply of social institutions. A parsimony both of men and of social forms makes the country different from the city. The opulence of modern life is urban. The poverty, especially of social life, is rural. So the husbandman has retained the institutions of the household farmer and added to them certain of his own which are carefully chosen and thriftily built. He has the oldest institution of all, the church, and the country school whose age is in some sections greater. Each of these has its modern formula. The husbandman wants his

church to be a community church, adapted, in ways that are now under discussion, to the whole community quite as much as to the comfort of the believers. He desires his school to be consolidated, thoroughly supervised and equipped for the teaching of agriculture, business, and home economics.

But beyond these the husbandman has organized, under the leadership of national societies, institutions of recreation and of health. At this point the greatest advance has been made. Some communities have proceeded to the provision of houses for recreation and of health centers before they have modernized their churches or consolidated their schools. Generally, however, the older institutions are reformed first, and by the same movement of domination the husbandman effects his control of the community by the organization of leisure-time forces in community-wide reform. This will be discussed later. It is necessary only here to make one's meaning clear by saying that the community-house movement, to which the Department of Agriculture has paid tribute in publishing three bulletins upon it, has extended widely as the characteristic form of community play and leisure.

The health center is the unit in public-health service, with a hospital at the county seat. Leaving the discussion of details to a later chapter it is sufficient to say here that mature farmers and their communities have been slower to make this provision than any other. Like other husbandman movements, however, public-health service comes in response to nation-wide and under world-wide forces.

The institutions in which the husbandman would say that his social life has its center are the economic. These

institutions for buying and selling, for processing, for credit, for manufacture, are as a rule cooperative. Slowly the mind of farmers has recognized that the methods by which a business house acts are not his methods. He has had to devise his own. His methods are not instinctive. They do not descend from father to son. The present generation has had to think them out and, by elimination through trial and error, to choose those which a world-wide experience has justified and a national discussion has approved. Near the center of a community of husbandmen you will find some organized institution for earning a living, for retaining a profit upon the wealth produced, for selling the products of the community or manufacturing them, and for focusing in that community the market of the whole world.

It is only necessary to add that there is a journalism that serves the farmer. Agricultural papers, weekly or monthly, are an established form of American life. They have great power and wide influence. Rather conservative, because of their dependence on business advertisements, they, however, keep pace with the developing mind and will of agrarian folk. Like the agricultural colleges, they have ministered to the intellectual life of the husbandman. They have taught him to think about his own affairs. They have strengthened a reasonable class consciousness in some cases. In crises they have been radical. But, as a rule, the agricultural press has plead the farmer's case, served as an exchange for ideas, and advocated the " unity and interrelatedness of the country life problem."

There is no mistaking a community of husbandmen. Wherever one goes he has but to look around him to see whether he is in a good farmers' town or not. The

evidence of vitality, of keen trade, of homely but quick, loyal sympathy between merchant and farmer, the courtesy on the part of the banker, the story told by advertisements and signs, proclaim the life of husbandmen centers. Unfortunately, the town and open country in America have not yet come to understand one another. The towns are still devoted to exploiting the farmer and have failed to make themselves centers of service to all the farmers of the country round. It is not possible yet to describe the husbandman's community as centering regularly in the village. Too often the town or village seduces the successful and intelligent farmer from his allegiance to the industry fundamental to the whole community and engages him in banking or speculation or commercial investment. While this continues community life for husbandmen will be incomplete. With the development of cooperative organization, which is masterful and absorbing, we believe that the villages will be dominated by the industry of the countryside. When the village has been dominated, and not before, we will have husbandmen communities; for tolerance and temperate discussion have not yet come in country life. The bond of organization in the form of social control which we call husbandry is the same as in the earlier form called pioneer. Its dominant Americans entertain one idea at a time. The leaders of the community impose it upon their fellows. Husbandmen differ from their predecessors in their capacity for convincing argument, in arraying facts, employing experts, reading newspapers, enlisting educators, and elaborating social institutions appropriate to their way of life. But they have their will, as their grandfathers did, and their fathers, too, by domination.

This is the place to say a word about the political forms of farming. In the Northwest there arose in 1913 the Non-Partisan Farmers' League. Like the agrarian societies of the seventies and eighties, this was a form of revolt. The farmers of the State, being eighty-five per cent of the population, had demanded from the legislature a remedy for grievances which they generally felt. This remedy was denied them, — at first, gently and firmly, at the last, with contempt and derision. Under radical leadership the farmers of the state organized with the swiftness of a prairie fire. They took control of the legislature and State government, believing that in its process was to be found the remedy for the injustices they suffered. They had a program of distributive industries under the control and ownership of the State. They believed that the State government, which had hitherto fenced them off from justice, could be made the agent of prosperity and largest distribution. Against fierce opposition, in which they encountered the power, as they believed, of the banking and commercial interests of the whole country, they won their case, and for five years ruled the legislature. The end of their rule came in 1920–21, with the defeat of their officers in a state-wide campaign and the imprisonment for a time of one of their radical leaders.

We believe that the farmers of the Northwest were guiltless of the radicalism and wrong-doing of which they were accused, for most of the accusations against them were, as one might expect in war time, superficial charges of political heresies, to which land-owning farmers in no country are inclined. Their grievances were real grievances. The injustice done them was keenly felt. The wrong against which they cried out has been

in part remedied. The institutions, once declared to be revolutionary, which they advocated, are being maintained in large measure by the conservatives who now govern the State. The mistaken factor in the Non-Partisan Farmers' League, as we believe, was the dependence of farmers for economic welfare upon political and legal action. It is the purpose of the writer in this book to say that husbandry arises as a mature form of socialization, which is a slow growth but is sure to unfold with economic forces. Legal and legislative action can remedy abuses in a negative way, but the range of law in bringing about prosperity is very narrow. Husbandry in its many forms and varieties is an evolution of the forces of education, cooperative organization, conscious and critical thought, study of the world market, response to the demands of that market, construction of social institutions fitted to the life of the people on the farms and in the towns, and the slow development of spiritual life and customs. In succeeding chapters we propose to discuss the elements of this mature and thorough organization of country life.

V

EXCEPTIONAL COMMUNITIES

So far we have considered the conditions which prevail most widely throughout the United States, whose causes and effects are the most generally operative. This book attempts to explain the rural process in the country as a whole. As soon as the community, after its settlement, becomes mature, these causes produce these effects. But there are exceptions which should be studied, at least as samples, and the reason for their different way of life made clear.

The exceptions to be noted are not departures from the customary American country life, but they illustrate it in the way of variation. The stream of most representative Americanism has followed westward from the North Central States; its narrowest measure being that line between the Appalachian Mountain range in West Virginia and Kentucky and the Great Lakes at Cleveland. Here has appeared every highly representative American rural experience, the most rapid change, the greatest individualism, the sharp and radical transition from one kind of community to another, extensive exploitation of land, and intelligent husbandry based on the study of the soil by educated farmers. All these have appeared and have wrought their due effects in other parts of the country to the south and to the west. But the unifying process which this book attempts to describe has been retarded in many sections of the country as it has not been retarded in the broad belt

between Missouri and Montana. In this chapter we are to discuss those retardations and departures from the usual process by which the country community is developed. The organizing and reconstructing force in this process is economic necessity; the retarding forces are generally social, geographic or historical.

"The best farmers in the country are the Mormons, the Scotch Presbyterians, and the Pennsylvania Germans." This was a general observation of Thomas Nixon Carver, speaking as an economist. The churches among these three classes of exceptionally prosperous farmers show great tenacity and are free from the weakness which otherwise prevails in the country church. There is a group of causes underlying this exceptional character of the three classes of farmers.

These exceptional farmers are organized in the interest of agriculture. The Mormons represent this organization in the highest degree. No other so large or so powerful a body of farmers united by as many interests is found in the whole country. They have approached the economic questions of farming with determination to till the soil. They distrust city life and condemn it. They teach their children and they discipline themselves to love the country, to appreciate its advantages, to recognize that their own welfare is bound up in their success as farmers and in the continuance of their farming communities. This agricultural organization centers about their country churches. They have turned the force of religion into a community-making power, and, from the highest to the lowest of their church officers, the Mormon people are devoted to agriculture as a mode of living.

The principle of organizing the community consciously

for agriculture results in the second condition of the life of these three exceptional peoples. They build agricultural communities. The Mormons are organized by an idea and by the power of leadership. They have recruited their population through preachers and missionaries. This new population is woven at once into the fabric of the community. They are not merely busy in the community; they are married to the community. The organization on which the Mormon community is based becomes embodied at once in a society, with its own modes of religion, family, and moral feeling and thought.

These two principles are discovered in the Pennsylvania Germans. For more than two centuries they have continued their settlements in Pennsylvania. They are today a chain of societies loosely related to one another through religious sympathy and a common tradition, but united only in the possession of certain characteristics. Many of them are members of religious societies of the Mennonite type; others are of the Reformed group of churches; but they and their churches have a common European origin. They also are an organization for agricultural life, though not so consciously organized as the Mormons. Their societies are older and they have motivated with instinctive processes that which is among the Mormons a matter of logic and shrewd application of principles.

The life of the Pennsylvania Germans is expressed in the community. They have as much aversion to other people as they have fondness for their own. Their religion consists of a set of customs in which to them the character of the Christian is embodied. These customs can be expressed and embodied only in the life of com-

mon people working on the land. They make plainness, industry, and patience, austerity of life, and other agricultural virtues to constitute sanctity. It is impossible to believe sincerely in their mode of life and not be a farmer. It is easy to believe the Pennsylvania Germans' code, if one is a farmer. And it is profitable as well.

The Scotch and the Scotch-Irish Presbyterians represent a third principle of agricultural success. Their churches are tenacious and their communities outlive the average. In them is represented in the highest degree the principle of austerity. By this I mean, as defined by an economist, the custom of living so as "to produce much and consume little." These people look upon life with severity. They have little sympathy with the expansive and exuberant life of the young. The men of the community, who are the producers, dominate the women, who are regarded as consumers. They exemplify to a slight degree the conscious organization for agriculture, and in a high degree the resultant social life which we have noted among the Mormons and the Pennsylvania Germans; but to the highest degree the Scottish Presbyterians represent this self-denial and rigidity of life, which appears in the others also, and they embody it in their creed. This austerity gives them a forbidding character, and robs them of some of the esthetic interest attaching to the other two, but it is possible that they come more near to the ideal type of American farmer because of certain other traits which they possess.

The Scotch farmer has not in the United States settled in communities or colonies, as he has in Canada. The typical farming community of this stock is Scotch Irish.

As Prof. R. E. Thompson has shown,[1] the emigrants from the north of Ireland, who are themselves of Scotch extraction, have colonized extensively, that is, they have settled their populations so as to cover a territory and possess it for themselves. The peculiarity of these Scotch Irish farming settlements, as shown especially in Pennsylvania, is their capacity to produce not only farm goods but leaders in sympathy with the whole of American life. The Mormons produce leaders, but their influence is compromised by religious prejudices. The Pennsylvania Germans have produced no national leaders whom they call their own, and very few writers or educators. The Scotch Irish have been able to maintain their own communities in the country and to find for these communities a sufficient leadership. They have sent forth into the general population a multitude of men for leadership in the army, in the legislatures, in the colleges and universities, and above all, in the pulpit.

In these three types of successful farmers, religion is an essential factor. No history can be written of the Mormons, of the "Pennsylvania Dutch," or of the Scotch Presbyterians without recording their religious devotion, their obedience to leaders, to customs, and to creed. One cannot live among them without feeling the peculiar religious atmosphere which belongs to each. They are admirable or obnoxious, according to one's like or dislike of this religious character of theirs, but it pervades the whole life of the community. If it be true that there is no type of farmer — except the scientific farmer of the past few years — who has succeeded as these three types have succeeded; and that there is no country community so tenacious as their communities are; and

[1] *History of American Presbyterianism*, by R. E. Thompson.

if it be true that these farmers more uniformly than other farmers are religiously organized, then it is not improbable that there is correlation, so far as American agriculture goes, between successful and permanent agriculture and a religious life. The country church becomes the expression of a permanent and abiding rural prosperity. Agriculture, by its very nature, develops a religious motive. An element of piety appears to be necessary in the make-up of the successful farmer.

In these three types of successful farmer there appears another principle which is common to them all. They are not only organized for farming, but they are organized as a mutual prosperity association, based on their consciousness of kind. Professor Gillin has called attention to the habit of the Dunkers in Iowa, who are of the Pennsylvania German sects, by which they extend their farming communities.

" The thing that is needed is to make the church the center of the social life of the community. That is easier where there is but one church than where there are several, but federation is not essential. Thought must be taken by the leaders to make the church central in every interest of life. I know of a community where that has been done. It is the community located south of Waterloo, Ia., in Orange Township. It is composed of an up-to-date community of Pennsylvania Dutch Dunkers. From the very first they have made the church central. When these great changes of which I have spoken began to occur, the leaders of that community began to take measures to checkmate the attractions of the towns for their young people. For example, Fourth of July was made a day of celebration at the church. When the people of other communities were

flocking to town by hundreds, the youth of that community were gathering, in response to plans well thought out beforehand, to the church grounds where patriotic songs were sung, games were played, a picnic dinner was served, and a general good time was provided for the young. They have also arranged that their young people have a place to come to on Sunday nights where they can meet their friends. The elders look to it that provisions are made for the gatherings of the young people on Sunday so that they shall ' have a good time,' with due arrangements for the boys and girls to get together under proper conditions for their love-making. Even their church ' love-feasts,' held twice a year, are also neighborhood gatherings for the young people. The church is the center of everything. Is a farmers' institute to be held in the community, or a teachers' institute? The church until very recently was open to it. Is a farm to rent or for sale? At once the leaders get busy with the mail, and soon a family from the East is on their way to take it. This country church has not remained strong and dominant in the country just by accident or even by federation. It has survived because it had wise leaders who have met the changes with new devices to attract the interest of the community and make the church serve the community in all its affairs, but especially on the social side. Such thought takes account of the ' marginal man ' too. The hired man and the hired girl, the foreigner and the tramp, are welcome there. No difference is made. There is pure democracy. With the growth of the class spirit I do not know how that can survive. These hirelings are not talked down to; they are considered one with the rest. They will some day get enough to buy a farm and become leaders

in the community, perhaps. The church is theirs as much as any one's else. It looks after their interest, not only for the hereafter, but here and now. Under its fostering care they form their life attachments, it provides for their social pleasures, it is the center to which they come to discuss their farming affairs or whatever interests them. And in spite of the fact that the preaching has little contact with life and its interests, so strong is the social spirit that the preaching can be left out of account. What could be accomplished were the preaching as consciously directed to forwarding the social interests of the community one can only speculate! " [2]

Thus they work for the propagation and extension of their own community. The Scotch Presbyterians in like manner favor their own kindred and their brothers in the faith. The Mormons are consolidated both by formal organization and by instinctive preference for their own, in a multitude of cooperating habits, through which they build up their communities and contend as one against their economic and religious opponents. It is not enough to say that this is clannishness; it is a mingling of kinship and religious preferences. It constitutes the strongest form of agricultural cooperation to be found in the United States.

A Quaker community represents ideal community life. There is none poor. The margin of the community is well cared for by the conscious and deliberate service of the central and leading spirits in the community. At Quaker Hill, New York, there has been for almost two centuries a community of Friends. The Meeting has now been " laid down " but the customs and manners by which these peculiar people maintain their com-

[2] Prof. John L. Gillin, in *American Journal of Sociology*, March, 1911.

munity life have been wrought into the social texture of the present population of Quaker Hill. During two centuries this community has cared for its own members in need. It was not beneath the dignity of the Meeting to raise money and purchase a cow, early in the eighteenth century, to "loan to the widow Irish." In the beginning of the twentieth century the few Quakers, the many Roman Catholics, and other "world's people" took part more than once in subscriptions by which the burden was lifted which had fallen upon some working man or poorer neighbor through the death of horse or cow or even to bear the expense incidental to the death of his child.

These Quakers cooperated in their business life. They made themselves responsible that no member of their Meeting should be long in debt. From 1740, for one hundred years and more, the records of the Meeting show that marriage was made impossible and other vital experiences were forbidden by the Meeting, unless the individual Quaker paid his debts and maintained his business on a level dictated by the common opinion of the Quaker body.[3]

From 1767, Oblong Meeting of Quaker Hill, New York, began the legislative opposition of the Society of Friends to the institution of slavery. This great economic movement expressed the degree to which the Quaker discipline merged the religious life in the economic life. This consolidation of religious and economic life was essential in the community building of the Quakers.

It is surprising to many to discover that the "Pennsylvania Dutch" were carried by the same movement of

[3] *Quaker Hill*, by Warren H. Wilson.

population which brought the Quakers into Pennsylvania.[4] William Penn spoke German as well as English. His mother was a German. When he inherited his father's claim against the British Crown, and received from Charles the Second the grant of that extensive territory in America on which he launched his Holy Experiment, he began to advertise and to seek for settlers on the Continent as well as in England.

William Penn was a Quaker, and on the Continent he found immediate response in the greatest number of cases among the various branches of Mennonites, Anabaptists, and other sects, who shared with the Quakers a common group of beliefs and experienced at this time a common persecution. William Penn, therefore, reaped a harvest of responses in the territory between the mouth of the Rhine and the Alps. His proposal made its own selection, and brought to America a population calculated like the Quaker population for the building of communities. The largest single contribution was made by the people of the Palatinate, who were at that period undergoing extreme persecution.

The communities founded within the first century after the opening of Pennsylvania have remained to the present day. The earliest establishments of Mennonites and Quaker communities in Pennsylvania have been duplicated in the westward stream of immigration, especially in Ohio and in Iowa. These people are roughly called the "Pennsylvania Dutch." Even when one meets them in Michigan, Iowa, or Minnesota, this name clings to them, and the form of social organization which they elaborated in eastern Pennsylvania still persists.

[4] *German and Swiss Settlements in Pennsylvania*, by Kuhns. Henry Holt & Co., 1901.

This social organization has varying characteristics. It is somewhat difficult to analyze the intricate windings and entanglements of doctrinal and practical belief in custom prevalent among the Mennonites, Amish, and Dunkers. Old school and new school branches have been formed in almost every one of these sects. Eccentric and peculiar principles of belief have formed the lesser and the least permanent groups; but there is a common principle in them all. Their ability to form communities in the midst of hostile populations and adverse conditions has been exercised in the cooperation between their religious and their economic habits.

The "Pennsylvania Dutch" have simple doctrinal characteristics. They have never worked out in detail the logic of their beliefs. They put the weight of their organization upon practical customs, as did the early Quakers. In some cases this applied to clothing; in some or all of these sects to the manner of speech; to family customs; but the one peculiar principle in it all, which has been vital to the success, to the persistence, to the wide extension of these sectarian groups, has been that the religious life has penetrated the economic life. They have not permitted members of their community to be poor. They have turned their attention and their religious sympathies to the economic margin of the community. They have enforced the payment of debts, and they have governed and controlled marriage conditions. By subtle enforcement of custom having the power of laws, they have governed the community in its vital relations, and perfected the system by which the poorest man shall make his living and by which the richest man shall make his fortune.

Passing through a market in Lancaster, Pa., I was

told by a resident that all the truck farming of the market for that city had come into the hands of the Amish, and my friend added, " If you go at an early hour to buy, and ask the price of certain vegetables, you will probably be told, ' We do not know the price yet; we will have to wait until all the farmers come in.' " That is, after two hundred and more years of living as farmers in this section of Pennsylvania, these sectarians maintain their community life, cooperate in the monopolizing of an industry, and in fixing the price of the monopolized product in the markets.

My purpose here has been to present the general characteristics of the most exceptional communities in the country. These are Mormon, Scotch Presbyterian, and Pennsylvania German. By their very names they indicate religious organization of the community and " birthright membership " associations. They are grouped under the one principle, that in them the religious organization is an expression of their social economy. Their social and economic life is under the domination of their religion.

These farmers are organized in the interest of agriculture. The resultant social life constitutes a most intense organization in which voluntary and conscious combination matures in instinctive union embodied in blood relationship, neighborliness, and economic union. These populations show the correspondence between economic and religious austerity. Thrift takes the form of dogmatic repression, and finally their organization and their relationship express themselves in organized efforts for the well-being of the community. They deliberately as well as instinctively cooperate.

The geographic force which retards the process of

national rural life is the interference of a mountain range or of a river or lake. Against this barrier economic wants beat in vain. Families who committed their destiny to a mountain county or took up land on the inaccessible shore of waters that are not readily crossed have to conform themselves to new limits. Their descendants exhibit the effects of land upon man. Kinship is sometimes not so strong as geography. The brother who settled in 1800 in Breathitt County, Kentucky, has given his state a very different family from that of the brother who moved on and settled in a " Blue Grass County."

The most striking illustrations of geographical retardation are in the southern Appalachian highlands. Settled in a region comprising over two hundred counties in eight states are more than three million persons, among whom the social cause and effect recorded throughout this book do not show the same results as are seen, for example, in Ohio. They are a retarded people, wittily called our " contemporary ancestors." The phrase-maker has compared them to rural grandparents dwelling in the attic of the land. When Illinois has become old in farm speculation, they are still living in the pioneer stage. When the blue grass counties of Kentucky are adjusting agriculture to the demands of scientific efficiency, they are still tilling the land as the Indians taught them and cooking their food by an open fire.

But some of the Appalachian barriers have been pierced by railroads. Highways climb the faces of the lofty steeps, pass through the gaps and ziz-zag down to the river bed. There is no longer a place inaccessible to the market nor a family who cannot get store clothes. Out from the narrow coves come migrants to the low-

lands; boys and girls who are going to school who will never go back: and the influence of the wants that other men know penetrates to every mountain home. So more slowly, but no less surely, the pioneer households will be superseded by migrant and exploiter types of home and community. Ten years ago in a mountain county of the Carolinas not one farmer in a hundred held one hundred dollars in his hand in an average year. Now they are able to respond to the drives for charity. They contribute something to the needs of Russia or Armenia. The mountains will never permit their dwellers to head the procession of husbandry, but slowly they advance their retarded pace in the direction of American rural progress.

The Ozarks also have their mountaineers. The Catskills and the Adirondacks set in a conservative pattern the New York stock, which is most progressive of all Americans. Between the Rockies and the Cascades we may expect in two generations to have mountaineers whose souls are cast in the granite.

There is a social retardation in race. The Negro farmers of the South do not perfectly illustrate the causes and effects which we are studying in this book. They have had in two generations the experience of the plantation, slavery, share-cropping, renting, wage-earning, peonage, and ownership. Therefore their sequence of social forms is not the same as that of the Middle West white farmer. The Negro has only begun to know husbandry. But because scientific progress has come all at once some Negroes attain to husbandry in the same decade with their white neighbors. The Negro comes to it from lower depths. He has never known the serene self-respect of the household farmer period of culture.

He has been always exploited. One cannot expect him to be the equal of the white man even when he has been to college and owns a farm. He exploits the soil as a tenant, for his father was taught to do so as a slave. Between the merciless commercial exploitation of the rural Negroes and the modern industrial education of some of them, there is the widest social chasm. The degraded share-cropper of the Mississippi Black Belt community is a long way down and the Negro banker of Mound Bayou — the celebrated Negro community — is a competent American in a class to which few white men gain access. So the retardation of the Negro constitutes a special racial problem. The Negro can only boast that some of his people have attained the higher level.

The Negro community is still as a rule attached to the white. Its members look on, but the progress made is not for them. Social friction holds most of them back in a subjection and exploitation from which they can be saved, we believe, only by a leadership more conscientious and unselfish than that which directed the whites from pioneer ways to husbandry. Probably some Negroes will climb in one generation from the abyss to the fertile plain by the footholds of education, and they will set the example to all their race for whom educational provision is not yet adequate.

The exceptional communities are not infinite in number. It used to be said by rural residents, "Ours is a peculiar community"; but the rapid extension of rural social study, reading, and teaching has made all men know that there is a continuous story of American rural life. It has had its beginnings. It has proceeded with reasonable flow of causes into their due effects

along a stream-bed whose obstacles explain its wanderings from the direct line. Most of the country has followed that line, from the transplanted manors in the Colonial States to the masterful husbandry of California, prospering through cooperation. The exceptions, the retarded communities, or those that have stepped aside for pious duty or racial necessity or behind a barrier of stone, carry their explanation with them. They too follow the line the year they are free. There is an evolution of the community.

There are other causes that retard, but their range is narrow. One is the effect of continued farm speculation, which has robbed the community of vital force and power to reproduce itself. Sterilized communities of this sort are found in the neighborhood of cities. The larger organization has overwhelmed the smaller. Prices of land are projected out from the city, which make it impossible for the farmer to continue as a vital factor in the country community. The growth of the city is, perhaps, slow. Its speculators precede for a long time its owners and residents. For a generation, therefore, it may be that a country town, awaiting city settlement, will be dried up and lifeless. Those who might live there are forbidden by the high prices of land. Those who were there originally have gone away or ceased to work, because they cannot, out of the industry of farming, make a living. They subsist upon the memory of what was and upon expectation. Such communities are many, even about an overwhelming center like New York. The town of Yorktown is an instance. It has not acquired the residential advantages of Bedford, its neighbor, and it has lost the agrarian character it so recently had. All its institutions are arrested. The

process of development towards husbandry has been checked. No formula for the social life of a community like this has been discovered.

The same arrest of cause and effect is evident in Middle Western towns which have suffered in the competition with other centers. The force at work in this case is also in the field of the wants. Telephones and automobiles, moving picture houses and other recently contrived social goods have attracted their residents away and have concentrated the interest of farmers from their surrounding spaces to the bigger center. One may travel in a section of the Northwest for ten miles sometimes or twenty, passing through moribund villages to a brilliant center where modern structures are serving profitably a bigger area. The garage, the telephone central, and the rural free delivery office are foci of a community life wider than was tributary to the livery stable and the post-office of the old type. These exceptions, however, do not discredit the rule, for in this case the gradual attainment of economic self-control and profitable agriculture has gone on unchecked.

VI

KINDS OF PEOPLE

Work among country people is limited by social traits which determine their response to any effort. One soon finds that he must know what kind of people they are. The persons living in rural communities are today under certain uniform influences throughout the whole land, but earlier episodes in their history control them, geographical barriers limit them, and the kind of occupation they follow in the country has its influence over their action. There are four groups of social forces which make people what they are and condition their common response to any proposal.

The first of the four groups of forces that make country people what they are is the geographical. The second is the historical or episodic. The third is the industrial. The fourth and most recent group of forces controlling the social life of people in the country is the newly opened box of economic wants.

The first of these forces is geographical. Within the boundaries of the United States are nine areas or regions in which dwell people having rural conditions controlled by the geographic group forces. In each area the first set of social causes is in the nature and product of the soil; the topography, mountainous, hilly or level; the conditions imposed by the river, lake or seashore. Each of these regions is greater than a state, and each contains a social mode of life among all the people in the open country and small communities which is characteristic

of no single state but of the whole region. Most of these regions have clear boundaries at least on one or two sides. Some have a doubtful margin on one side or another. These boundaries follow state boundaries only in a rough and general way. For our present purposes the regions are made up of groups of states, assigning each state to the region in which the most of its territory falls. The reader will see that a more precise tracing of these boundaries would divide certain of the states. But that process would be attended with many complications. The basis of each region is geographical but the division takes into account economic, racial, and social history.

The Colonial Region: — New England, New York, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey, having common settlement in early times by colonies from western Europe and a continuous direct European influence for two hundred years.

The Southern Region: — Including all states south of the Mason-Dixon line, east of the Mississippi River, including Louisiana. This section is also colonial but is characterized in addition by the consequences of cotton farming, Negro labor, and the social results of Negro and white races living side by side.

The Appalachian Region: — Consisting of over two hundred counties in eight southern states which are located in the Appalachian and Cumberland ranges with valleys between. These people are of a post-colonial origin, practically all white, highly individualistic, socially retarded, and conservative.

Middle West Region: — The states of Ohio, Indiana, Michigan, Illinois, Wisconsin, and Iowa (with parts of Nebraska and Kansas), having in common a mature

MAP SHOWING SOCIOLOGICAL REGIONS OF UNITED STATES

rural life based upon farming. Farms are of comparatively small size. Residences not far apart; social life intelligent and progressive. Discussion both practical and philosophical, maintained on a high level. A dominant, progressive people. Villages are centers of trade, religion, and culture. Education advancing; cities many and potent.

The Northwest Region: — The states of Minnesota, North and South Dakota, Montana (possibly Idaho and Washington should be here classified). Rural life is based on the spring wheat crop; farms far apart; villages few and small. Social intercourse retarded. A particular immigration from northwestern Europe has been of large influence. Big cities very few, towns and cities alienated from open country.

The Southwest Region: — The states of Texas, Arkansas, Missouri (and perhaps Oklahoma, New Mexico, and Arizona). Country life initial. The same as that of the old South but western in spirit and method. People cordial; social life warm and lively but at the same time progressive. Cities normal and happily related to rural enterprises and social feeling.

The Prairie Region: — Oklahoma, Kansas, and Nebraska. This region perhaps will disappear, but at present country life is conditioned by winter wheat crop. Rural households widely separated; social life weak. Towns and villages more numerous than in the Northwest and in better favor. Big cities few and national in outlook rather than regional in interest.

The Range Region: — States of Wyoming, Idaho, Colorado, Utah (and perhaps Arizona and New Mexico). Like the prairie section this one has boundaries not permanently developed. Its most general character-

istics are those of the cattle range. In strong contrast to these are the limited and localized irrigation sections of each of the above states. Individual property ownership the highest in the Union. Section characterized by mountain ranges and semi-arid stretches between.

The Pacific Region: — States of California, Oregon, Washington (and Nevada). (Nevada should be classed with the Range Region except for convenience of access to California.) Characterized by the effects of the Pacific water-laden winds which precipitate their moisture upon the Cascade Range, by soil of volcanic origin, irregular supply of water which has occasioned extensive irrigation development. This region shows contrasting social groups from the simple culture of wheat to the most highly specialized culture of fruit.

The social episodes in American history which have decided the character of a section of the people are limited in number, but very positive and definite. They constitute together the second group of moulding forces. In the face of the American tendency to uniformity, in spite of our liking for the domination of one idea, there are kinds of people in the United States who are to be understood in terms of a historic episode.

(a) *The Puritans*

In New England developed both a population and an idea which have extended their influence throughout the country. The Puritan conception of austere domination of life by ideals, which they have imposed upon others as well as upon themselves, has been carried to the very boundaries of American life. It has been welcomed generally among country people, to a degree by people who live in the city. Extending westward from New England as far as Denver and southward to

the Ohio River and to Kansas, the Puritan idea and the Puritan population are now to be found in the ascendant among country people. No episode in American history has been more influential than this.

(b) *The Plantation*

The plantation, like the New England town, is a changeling child of the manor. Its influence and the people who carry that influence with them have extended westward from the Southern States. The whole country has been affected by the ideas and sentiments nourished for long upon the plantation. The schoolmaster of this social force was the slave-owner. The plantation influence is essentially autocratic. It is exactly contrary to Puritanism. Both are austere and domineering, but there is a warmer humanism, a kinder feeling, a more boisterous as well as a more sincere friendliness in the plantation tradition than in the Puritan tradition. In the South and Southwest, and in the Pacific regions, the ideas taught on the plantation are a force to be reckoned with. Race superiority, the dominance of those in the lead, disregard of moral logic, and direct action in social control are expressions of the working of this force. Yet there is a more genial humanism in the plantation order of society than in the Puritan.

(c) *The Ohio Valley*

The Ohio Valley was a tarrying place of the migrants who early crossed the Appalachian Range. They found in Ohio and Kentucky, in Indiana and Illinois, during the latter part of the eighteenth century and the early part of the nineteenth, a fertile and welcoming land. They were separated at that time from the colonial population in the Eastern States by a hostile mountain barrier. They were obliged to develop their own life

together without direct influence of England or of Europe, such as the colonists enjoyed. They invented ways of social life out of their own materials. They devised a system of philosophy and modes of living all their own. The effect of this independence showed itself first in religious and political forms. About 1800 spontaneous revivals of religion in northern Kentucky, near the Ohio, first gave voice to this new social philosophy. These revivals were Protestant and yet they knew nothing of the European tradition, except its Bible and elements of its creed. Among the colonists practically every church was a European sect or the mission of an established European church. In the Ohio Valley religion was something new, violently emotional, individualistic in a drastic, thorough way, expressing itself in preaching and in no other religious form. This new Protestantism extended very rapidly for twenty years in the Ohio Valley. Its influence has been penetrating the whole country during the century that has followed.

The political influence, as one might expect, followed the same type as the religious. In the early part of the nineteenth century, the stark individualism of the Mississippi Valley, which was a conception of life born of the brain of a white man in the wilderness, west of the Appalachian Mountains, demanded a hearing of the country. Its first victory was in the election of Andrew Jackson. Its highest expression was in Abraham Lincoln, whose well-poised individualism freed the slave.

(d) *The Fortune Hunters*

The gold-seekers furnished an episode in American history and released a force that has characterized a certain kind of our people. In 1849 the quest of gold in California was an experience which continued for many

decades and stamped its character upon people living in the West. One cannot understand settlements on the Pacific Coast without knowing that their foundations were laid by gold-seekers. With this may be compared the quest of petroleum. Pennsylvania, Oklahoma, and Texas oil towns are very like California towns because their men were called together from all parts of the land to seek a fortune. This episode therefore might be entitled, "The Fortune Hunters," for there are communities in America in which live kinds of people not to be explained by the geography about them or by the industry to which they put their hands. They are the "native sons" of the seekers of the Golden Fleece.

(e) *Negroes*

Negroes were brought to America as slaves. They have never been welcomed socially by the Anglo-Saxon. Shut in by an impassable wall of alien prejudice, but invited and solicited as laborers, their communities are found throughout the whole country. In the South and Southwest theirs are rural communities. The Negro in America, though he looks to the city as others do and fills considerable sections of the cities, still prefers the land and is more at home upon the farm than in the town. The presence of Negroes in any community is a social force not limited by the section in which they dwell, but penetrating the whole population, because of the peculiar racial dualism it involves and the social antagonism it awakens.

(f) *The Indians*

The American Indian is a force in American life. Retreating from the Eastern States, their tribes, as yet in large part savage, are a measurable factor in the Prairie, Southwestern, Range, and Pacific States. They hold

extensive land areas and must be dealt with by the exploiters of natural resources. They stiffen and retard the development of certain states, as Oklahoma, New Mexico and Arizona. One cannot understand even the life of the white man there without reckoning into the problem how potent the Indians are. Their social conservatism holds them back from the white man's ways. They shelter themselves under government protection and government grants.

(g) *The Mexicans*

The Mexicans who have come into the United States in recent years as laborers have been estimated at one-third or one-fourth of the population of the Republic of Mexico. They are a shifting and inferior class of laborers, especially in the Southwestern States. They do not themselves expect to be permanent settlers and may return to Mexico, though the most of them will doubtless become Americans.

(h) *Germans and Scandinavians*

German and Scandinavian influence has been potent in the Northwest. Tenacious and industrious people, originally religious in their communities, intellectually superior in a crude, dominating way, given to cooperative action, they have made a great contribution to the Northwestern States.

(i) *Pennsylvania Germans* (See Chapter IV.)

(j) *Mormons* (See Chapter IV.)

(k) *French Canadians*

The French Canadians in recent years have invaded New England, northern New York and northern Michigan. Separated by language, kinship, and religious custom from those about them, and accustomed to the working of a social spirit that has kept them aliens in

Canada for two hundred years, they will be in the Northern Colonial and Middle States in increasing force.

Other episodes in American history may be added to those here mentioned, though their number is not great, for we are here concerned only with episodes of interest to the whole people. The test of whether a historic episode should enter into this list is this: Has it so influenced a section of the population as to give them a permanent character and is this character so powerful and effective upon the life of the nation as a whole that all men should know it?

The third group of social forces which mould the individual is composed of the kinds of industry. These are not agricultural alone, but they include all the industries by which food and raw materials are produced. Only those are named which exert a formative influence upon social character, as this chapter includes only those forces which attain national dimensions or significance.

Cotton Farming

The first of these is cotton farming. Historically the raising of cotton was one of the first industrial processes to bring cash to the American colonists. Cotton can be shipped conveniently. Its bulk is small compared to its value. It can be stored indefinitely, does not easily deteriorate and, as a result, it is the cash crop of the whole South. It has for two centuries been a pioneer and a poor man's crop. Its proper climate is that of the Southern States. The labor in the cotton field is hard, the seasonal exactions heavy, but the crop can be harvested by an easy-going, indolent working force. Little intelligence is required of the worker. Machinery has been adapted to the beginning of the cotton crop, but never to the harvesting of it; so that

an inferior labor force attaches itself permanently to cotton lands. Negro labor and the more ignorant white labor have their opportunity in the cotton crop. Therefore, poverty, careless work, and low ideals are the rule among cotton hands. Naturally such labor is exploited. Cotton, which is a poor man's crop, was the basis first of an aristocratic and later of a monetary lordship. The boisterous, rude social life and low economic standards of the workers in the cotton fields have always characterized the communities where cotton is the staple. Because of the racial antagonism between the white and the Negro, the cotton-growing areas have unsteady and variable obedience to law. Stores, banks, and their owners prosper, but the workers are poor. Because the marginal people of the community are of an inferior culture, the prevailing community life is emotional, noisy and sometimes lawless.

Dairying

The production of milk and milk products involves a high degree of intelligence, permanence of residence, a skilled and far-sighted care of the soil, experience in the selection of cattle, and some knowledge of the market. It opens the way to cooperative processes in the production of butter and cheese. Dairying is an exacting and laborious form of farming, and it necessitates a trained labor force. It tends, because cattle need personal care by intelligent minds, to organize itself in comparatively small farms. Until the World War, the dairy industry in the United States was under control of farmers who did not purchase feed. Now the price of milk is controlled by farmers who buy their feed. The market, centering in big states, is being organized. Cooperative control has come. The farmer has learned to obey the

22,023

legal requirements of the state and the industrial exactions of the city market. He is developing an obedience to his own leaders. The labor income has been small but improvement is at hand. The social effects of the dairying industry are in the direction of a closer social life, higher organization, intellectual maturity, industrial skill and effective leadership.

Diversified Farming

Diversified farming is that sort which produces three to five products for sale. Dairying is usually diversified farming which has become specialized. But by diversified farming we mean the production of grain crops, hogs, beef, cattle, fruit, tobacco, or other products, three or five in number, on the same farm. There is a higher intelligence as to markets, industrial processes, business and labor in this type of farming than in perhaps any other. The farms tend to be small; families live not far apart. There is a happy combination of freedom, which dairying alone does not allow, with intensive work that makes the farmer in a diversified farming section a very good citizen.

With this kind of farming goes permanence of residence, close and compact community life, reasonable institutions of comfort and convenience, and a lively social intelligence.

Irrigation

No kind of farming moulds its people more perfectly than this. The holdings are small, the crops are specialized, the exactions of the season and of the market are at the highest. Collective exploitation of the land is usually accompanied by collective administration of water supply. The farmer who irrigates has an awareness of government, of the law, and of his community

which he never forgets. The communities in the Range Section, particularly in Utah, whose members operate irrigated lands, usually live in villages; always the residences are near to one another. They have, as all farmers have, the immediate relation to nature itself; but, as no other farmers, they dwell in the collective life of the commonwealth. The irrigators are organizers of the most powerful cooperatives in America. A part of the cause is found in the effect of their kind of farming upon the farmers themselves.

Fruit-Raising

Here is a specialized crop in which the farmers may be so specialized as not to own even a horse or a cow. They are one-crop farmers. Apples, citrus fruits and grapes have their way of monopolizing the attention of those who cultivate them. They demand a high intelligence in the operator, and they reward him with ownership of land, close cooperative connections with his neighbors, and an intimate relation to the market. Fruit-growing is as yet immature in this country. It is probable that the farmers of this type will center in villages and towns. Some of them on the Pacific coast already center both their economic and social life, which is unusual with farmers, in towns. When we have fully developed our fruit-growing industries and ripened the social product, — that is, the type of school, church, lodge and store that corresponds to this, — it is probable that they will be like irrigation communities in their social forms.

Corn and Beef Farms

The industry of corn production and its kindred form of hog raising are highly developed in the Middle West. From simple beginnings the corn-growing industry has

steadily developed without a break through stages of progress that have retained the same farmers and their sons, from the crude tillage of the thinner, higher soil in Illinois and Iowa to the massive proportions of the present corn and hog production of the black belt. No farmers in America are so masterful, independent, and pragmatical as these. They live near the great markets and along the line of railways which carry the traffic of the continent. Big machinery and heavy production have from the first been in their minds. They fought the railroads and they never forgot their victory of the 'Seventies. They are, as a rule, strong individualists; but are ready when necessary to combine for a battle and willing, if in rare occasions they must, to cooperate. It has grown out of their crop experience that they speculate; so that the corn-growing farmer began the national process of exploiting land. They have made themselves independent of the particular farm by the habit of dwelling for a generation in the town; but the same population, in spite of much buying and selling, still owns the land in the Middle West.

Lumbering

This is a form of industry once agricultural which has become capitalistic. It is no longer in the hands of farmers. In one generation the control of timber-lands has passed from the hands of the operator into those of the investor.

The workers in a lumber camp are seasonal or occasional laborers dwelling apart from the older communities, generally in habitations which, until recently, were too often disgracefully sordid and bare. Deprived of social intercourse and family life, these men were for long a neglected class. Many of them in despair turned

radical. Some of them were recruited from the criminal or disorderly elements of older states. No permanent social institution comes of the lumber camp itself, for when the timber has been harvested the company moves its men and its mill to another place. Some efforts, ineffective as a rule, have been made by companies to build communities upon the deserted site of these camps. But most of the proprietors have been indifferent to the future of the cut-over lands.

Other kinds of productive industry which have a moulding force upon the social character of the people engaged in them are fishing, coal or iron mining, the cattle range, and wheat farming.

The problem of describing the kind of people who live in a certain rural community is not of infinite complexity. The number of forces which go to make the character of a community is limited. There are not more than nine great regions in the United States where social character extends with uniformities throughout the rural population. The number of historical episodes in American history which have put their marks upon a part of the population and contributed to the national life in so doing is limited. The number of kinds of productive industry is limited. If therefore a community is to be analyzed by the effects upon it of these three groups of forces, it will be found that there are in America less than fifty " kinds of people " whose characteristics are of national concern. This statement applies only to the rural population. With increasing difficulty the same argument can be applied to the population of the cities. The villages and towns which are set in an agricultural country share the characteristics of the rural people about them. But as cities grow

in size, other factors enter which we have not here considered. The purpose of this chapter is to furnish the key to the analysis of a social population in the country. The social worker or civic employee, minister or school teacher, who desires to understand the people with whom he works will find in these three groups of forces the main explanation of their social character. Other characteristics of theirs are less important. The social worker will do well who understands the people in terms of the geographical, historical, and industrial forces which have contributed most to making them what they are.

The social understanding of the people of a town or community is based on the comprehension of their prevailing characteristics. That which is confined to few is not so important. Traits which prevail among them all are of the highest consequence. We are here discussing the social habits and characteristics which will be found throughout the whole community. Upon them a social institution can found its policies.

The new group of forces which are adding themselves to the three we have discussed is the group known as wants. The geographical, historical, and industrial forces described are comparatively quiet. Communities resulting from these three forces are static. There is not in them an explanation of the present disturbance of country life. One can understand that only when he knows how the people of the farm and of the town are seeking the things which other men produce. So long as the farmer was indifferent to other men's things and produced his own, he was a conservative, even though his industry developed from crude corn production to scientific hog production. But when the farmer begins

to buy most of his food from the store, to clothe himself and his family according to the fashions, to buy and use a modern automobile, and to educate his children, he is obeying wants which will radically change the character of country life. They will not of necessity take him off the farm but they will alter the make-up of the country community, the organization of the farm household, the composition of the village or town and give a new character to the social institutions which are handmaids of the household. So there is a fourth group of forces making the American farmer what he is. The wants are the most potent dynamic; they are the most fruitful of change. Their mandate will be obeyed. When the farmer joins the consuming classes he lays hold of the force which is imperative in modern society.

The land is the anvil, the wants are the hammer, the social history and the type of industry are the two helpers who wield the sledge. All four shape the kind of people to their type.

The purpose of this chapter is to provide a practical method of instructing the workers who do community service under any of the great national agencies, in order that they may bring to their task as much knowledge as possible of the kinds of people among whom they are to work. The local worker is frequently debarred from influence by his ignorance of the "kind of people who live here." This analysis classifies communities into types not more than fifty in number, by the crossing of the lines of these four forces, and thus reduces the problem of national administration to measurable terms. The kind of people to whom a county worker is sent may be described as "Colonial — Puritan — Dairy Farmers — City-Controlled"; and a brief paragraph descrip-

tive of each of these four expressions would adequately introduce them even to a stranger. Or, an educator sent to the Rockies might be introduced to the kind of people who live there by the title: Range — Irrigation Farmers — Sons of Gold Seekers — With Few Wants. These four types of social forces are the most potent of all. Their marks are the deepest.

For purposes of education also and the study of the rural population this method divides the material into units that can be understood. We believe that these units of interest, or "case groups" as Professor David Snedden has called them, are real elements in American national life, which the student and the teacher may accept as integers in the problem.

The supervision of community work on a national scale appears to be the key to the solution of local problems in the fields of education, agriculture, health, recreation, and religion. For those who administer in these fields, the division here presented will, we trust, be useful. It is obvious that those who administer within the state may carry the same method into local detail. It must not, however, be pressed beyond the point at which it discloses and describes real units of experience and feeling which are the result of fundamental causes such as have been here described.

VII

THE COMMUNITY

There is much writing upon the rural community. Many attempts are made to define it. If the state were to adjust the boundaries of the local civil division to the collective life of the people who live together in the country and share many things in common, as the state does in the case of cities, this discussion would be at an end. Sociologists are concerned over this reality appearing in agrarian life for which no proper form has been assigned. No one worries about what a city means or philosophizes upon urban units, but thinkers are solicitous concerning the change from the unimportant and simple thing we call the neighborhood to that new reality in country life which we call the community. In a rough way we know what we mean by it but every time we venture a concrete use of the word we encounter comparisons and contradictions. What then is a country community? A village is defined to be a collection of residences and business houses, sometimes incorporated though not always, the population of which is less than 2,500 and more than 250. We might define a hamlet as a collection of houses and serviceable businesses with a population of less than 250. Having so done, we still would not have comprised the community.

The word town is commonly used by Americans to mean a village, sometimes a small city. Different states employ the terms township and borough to mean

something that they have written into the law, in one of the crude legislative attempts to define the country community, for a particular purpose. Some of these purposes are unworthy efforts by a limited class who are determined to take more care of their own interests than of their neighbors, by defining the community in a narrow way and confining to those narrow bounds the taxation of their property. The effect of this is that many people who belong in the same community are forbidden the use of taxes upon properties concentrated in the limited district, town, borough or municipality. In some parts of the country the state laws permit the creation of an incorporated city in the case of so few as two hundred people. These are abuses unrebuked by intellectual or ethical ideals of rural community life. To consider them is to get no help in the defining of the rural community except irritation.

Meantime, the rural community is expressing itself. For a half century schools have been consolidated in the country in obedience to the definition of a community in terms of convenience in attending school. The radius of a consolidated district is the convenient team haul for a horse-drawn stage or now-a-days a motor-driven bus. The people who organize a consolidated school have for that purpose defined the community.

In agriculture the community has been defined in the organization of cooperatives. These societies are jealously watched by their members so that they are as a rule organized to serve an area of no longer radius than a convenient journey on the part of a farmer to the exchange, to the creamery or to the grain elevator. He desires to be there when things are decided. He therefore does not join a cooperative that is too far from

his home to drive. In spite of motor transit the cooperative still operates within the radius of the convenience of a horse-drawn vehicle. The reason is that these societies for buying, selling and manufacturing handle freight and in carrying produce on the farmer's roads the truck has not displaced the draft-horse.

The community is defined in the organization of recreation. People in the country and the village, when they get together for a pleasant evening, will not go farther than they can quickly drive. Most of the farms are "off the state road." It is not pleasant to drive more than five or six miles on a dirt road after dark even in an auto. Therefore the radius of service of the community house is about the same as that of the consolidated school. Within this radius social meetings cause the neighbors to be well acquainted with one another. Young men and women form their vital acquaintances which ripen into affection and marriage within this radius, just as they did in the old buggy-riding days. The length of the drive may be doubled by the auto but one doubts the assertion that it is to be multiplied by ten. Social acquaintance is still limited to the interlacing lines of periodic and habitual meeting.

Church life is like the other collective movements of the community. Its radius is not that of the occasional adventure. People do not joy-ride to church any more than they do to the creamery or to the school. Country life, in spite of gasoline, is still staid and moderate. The boundaries of the rural parish, although considerably extended beyond those set by local jealousy and family antagonism, are not, in the experience of country ministers, more than four miles from the church building. Health too has begun to establish the boundaries of

the district nursing association. The trained nurse located after the war in a country neighborhood found herself confronted with jealousy and inertia of people who did not believe they needed her services. Especially suspicious were they of her propaganda for preventive medicine. In order to overcome this inertia she must do bed-side service as an alphabet with which to spell out her program. In so far then as public health work proceeds by the care of the individual patient, the nursing association must be confined to the local community.

The country community has a character of its own which reaches a boundary and stops there. The influence of leading rural personalities does not extend indefinitely in the country, but disappears at the boundary of the next community. Intimate knowledge of personalities is confined to the community and does not extend beyond the team-haul radius. Within this radius all the affairs of any individual are known in minute detail; nobody hopes to live a life apart from the knowledge of his neighbors; but beyond the community, so defined, this knowledge does not extend.

The average man would define the community as "the place where we live." This definition contains every essential element: locality, personal and social relations, and vital experiences. The community is that complex of economic and social processes in which individuals find the satisfactions not supplied in their homes. The community is the larger social whole outside the household; a population complete in itself for the needs of its residents from birth to death. It is a man's home town.

This conception of the community as a vital common

possession explains the relation of religious, educational, ethical and economic institutions to one another. The community is the clearing-house of all these influences. It is the medium by which they exchange with one another, in the interest of human life. The perfection of this exchange and the abundance of communal influences makes the community good and desirable, or poor and undesirable.

Sometimes one says that his community is "a good place to live in." When it is ample for the needs of individual lives men move into it, and the average man finds there a contented and satisfied life. The decay of the community is indicated by the departure of individuals and of families in quest of a better center for the supply of vital human needs. Some go to make more money elsewhere, some depart for educational advantages and some move away because social life is lacking or religious privileges are not suitable. These four vital essentials — economic, ethical, educational, and religious — make up the elements in the community's service to the individual. A fifth is added of late in the health service which some communities offer to those who live there.

The community or neighborhood in the open country is normally furnished with certain institutions essential to the life of the people. In earlier days the community was sufficient unto itself. Very little was imported. Everything for use in the community was raised therein and manufactured in the households. A system of exchange was gradually effected through the country store. The country store of 1770 in Dutchess County, New York, had an amazing relation to a wide population. The radius of the life dependent upon it was the

same as the radius around the Quaker Meeting, beside which this store was placed, and the goods used in the community with few exceptions were produced and manufactured in this radius of the team-haul of ten miles.[1]

Nowadays the normal country neighborhood has a store, a blacksmith shop, a church, and a school. In the recent past certain classes of peddlers regularly visited the country community, though their place in the rural economy is diminishing. The country store in many communities is already closed or is maintained with increasing difficulty. So long, however, as the horse-drawn vehicle is the type of transportation in the country, the elements of the country community must remain substantially the same.

The economic life of the community is necessarily a part of the general economic life of the population as a whole. The world economy has in the past hundred years, through the perfection of the means of transportation, dominated the communal economy. In 1810 every country community was obliged to manufacture its own raw products into consumer's goods, so far as possible within its own limits. In 1910 it was no longer profitable for any country community to do so. The result is that the economic energy of the community is usually invested in a specified industry to which the whole community is primarily devoted. If it be a rural community this product takes the form of a "money crop." In the corn belt there are other products raised from the soil besides corn, but the world economy assigns to that fertile section the producing of corn as the most profitable and the simplest task.

[1] *Quaker Hill*, by Warren H. Wilson. New York.

What is this community?[2] One might define it as the habitat of a farm family or we might say that it is made up of the people who regularly and periodically meet; of their property, institutions and lands; and of the customs and mutual acquaintances growing out of their frequency of meeting. Again the community may be defined as the local organization of the world's interests, the focus of national forces. To put this in simpler terms, the community is as a rule composed of the farmers and villagers whose life centers in a trading and social area while their business extends out among the farms for a radius of from five to ten miles.

As a rule, in a rural community there are none of the characteristic manufacturing plants which are found in cities. The definition of the term rural used in the census is approximately accurate. The rural people are those living in communities of less than 2,500 population. In our discussion of country life we must imagine the whole country as mapped and described in local areas called communities to which, however, civic organization and legislation have as yet given no appropriate form. If the state legislatures were accustomed to adjust the boundaries of rural residential areas and business units, the present discussion of the nature of the rural community would be at an end. It partakes too much of the mystical just now. Its ends, however, are practical. The writers and the dreamers, who try to visualize the rural community, are preparing public opinion for the treatment of rural communities in the same plastic way in which cities are treated by the state legislatures.

[2] See the definitions of the community in *The Rural Community, Ancient and Modern*, Sims. Scribner's. *Rural Organization*, Burr. The Macmillan Co. *Mobilizing the Rural Community*, Morgan. Massachusetts Agricultural College. *Locating the Rural Community*, Sanderson. Cornell University.

There must be a common cause for the likeness in all the definitions of the community. It is found in the cow, the corn plant, and the orchard tree. They have to be waited on periodically, by a rule of their nature. The farmer is their nurse, groom and familiar. These creatures were tamed so long ago that history does not record the century in which they joined the farm family. The domestic animals and plants were all domesticated in barbaric times.[3] The care and use of them lifted man above the savage. At least one of them, the maize plant, has now no near kindred among wild creatures. The other two might go back to the wild but they would lose their pride of pedigree. On the farm they are proud and opulent. In the woods they would be weed and scrub.

To keep their production up to the measure of human necessity, man waits on the domestic creatures, feeds them, houses them, grooms them, regulates their breeding. To say that mankind serves these creatures on the farm is to say that the farmer does it, for it is a specialized occupation. People in the country are trustees of civilization in that they care for the animals and plants domesticated since the race of men emerged from savagery into barbarism. The excess production of the farm, by which cities live, is secured through the care of these domesticated creatures, the plants in the orderly rows in the ploughed field, the cattle in their stalls, the hogs and sheep in their pens, the poultry in their yard. Their fat and milk and eggs, their abundant grains and juicy fruit would be no more valuable if they were still wild than venison is, which the wild deer furnishes. Most men in cities live out their days with-

[3] See *Staircase Farms of the Ancients*. National Geographic Magazine May, 1916.

out tasting the flesh of wild creatures, except of fish. The farm feeds them all.

The claims of domesticated animals upon the farmer are such as to chain his foot to the homestead. He can go from home only so far as will permit him to get back in time for milking. He can go on a visit, but he must return in time to spray his orchard trees or to cultivate his corn. The only type of farming that permits the farmer a long range is the one-crop farming which may, if he keeps no horse or cow or fowls, give him liberty for certain months of the year. Such farmers are often too poor to travel. So practically all those who produce the world's greatest supplies of wealth are bound to the homestead by a short tether. This "short team-haul" of his is the radius of the rural community. Within its range he knows everybody. Outside it he goes not once in a hundred journeys. The boundary of his short journeys is the periphery of the consolidated school district, of the public-health nursing association, of the cooperative creamery association, of the community-house membership, and of the church parish.

We have found in recent surveys that the banking community and that of general merchandising, which centers in a country town, is larger than the type described. The successful bank or general store is not found in every community, and the population served by such an institution may include all the people of a county. With better roads, and motors to drive on them, the radius of the community is being lengthened by reason of occasional, but frequent, journeys of twenty miles or more. A town in Texas has set up a natatorium with elaborate bathing conveniences. To it on a summer evening all the white people are said to

come from a radius of twenty-five miles. Thus a wide community is formed, a broad basis of acquaintance. It is possible that the rural community is being permanently and greatly enlarged. At the time of this writing one cannot measure this extension. It is useless to speculate upon a matter so complex. It will be determined only by experience. We have not become fully adjusted to the automobile. Some invention of the next decade may limit or may enlarge the community. For the present it is a mixture of intense acquaintance, confined to the circle of freight and produce hauling within which farmer and villager live. It is a social phenomenon, characteristic of the country, of which legislators have not yet taken notice. The map of the country is divided up into little societies, in each of which dwell three to ten score farm families, each of them exacting from domestic animals and plants the food and raw materials out of which the wealth of the nation is chiefly made.

The discussion in the years since the publication of C. J. Galpin's *Rural Life* and of Paul Vogt's *Introduction to Rural Sociology* has emphasized the village as the center of the rural community. In this book we are interested in the rural community as a residential and economic unit. Therefore, the experience of the farmer who is the producing resident in the country is made fundamental. Studies made by Galpin and the subsequent discussion of them have, however, shown that, in the economic and productive life of the country community, the village is the chief center. These studies are not so conclusive as to the social life. They show that the banking, the trading, the marketing, the journalism of the town or county seat, all center in the

village. From this center the community has been studied as a "trade basin." The graphic showing of these trade areas with the neutral zones between their outer bounds is a brilliant exhibit of community life. But Galpin's studies were never carried to a logical conclusion in either of two directions. First, he has made no study of a village itself, its composition, the institutions which are usually located in it, the proportion of the village population to the population of the trade basin around it, and the principle on which persons and families are selected who reside in the village. This is an important omission, because the parsimony which limits the population of the open country limits also the village. As open country populations have diminished during the last thirty years the villages in which they center have also diminished in the number of their residents. Why is this?

Galpin's studies did not pursue the social problem. He makes it appear that the village is a center of a very limited population area, so far as voluntary institutions like lodges and churches are concerned. It is evident that families who live on farms do not like to go to the village for social leisure or for religious worship, if they can find a provision of this sort in the open country. Of this tendency no study was made.

Yet, in spite of these defects, the village is a center of the rural community. For most of the experiences of the community as described in this chapter, it is the proper center. The only analysis of the village we have is that offered by Douglas in his book *The Little Town*, and it is inadequate. There is need of a more complete study of village life in order to record what elements go to make up a village and in what proportion they are

assembled. For we may be assured that there is nothing superfluous in the usual American village. Voluntary residence in a chosen place attracts the American population to the city. Those who live in the village can usually give a reason for their residence there.

The usual village in the path of typical American progress in the Middle West contains the following elements: one or more railroad depots; a long distance telephone central and a farmers' telephone central; a wholesale shipping house; two grain elevators; a condensery; a produce exchange; general and special stores, usually two to ten in number; lodges, two to ten; churches, five to ten; public schools, elementary and secondary; shipping agents, one to three, who buy country produce; lawyers, one to three in number; doctors, one to three; water-supply system and reservoir; lumber yard; oil and gas station; flour mill; tile works; brick yard or lumber mill; garages, one to three in number; two hotels; newspaper and printing shop; a library in some instances; one or more laundry establishments in the larger villages; a light or power establishment.

These typical institutions will be substituted in the South by others in some cases. Villages differ according to the section of the country in which they are and according to the accident of their possessing a school population by reason of the location of some private school or normal school in the village. Some villages contain also a considerable number of retired farmers. Douglas brings out with painful acuteness the number and proportion of people who live in pinched circumstances in the Middle West village.

The proportion which the village bears in the number

of its residents to the surrounding population is interesting. Douglas claims that it varies in accordance with the density of the population, with the prosperity, with the physiography of the section of the country, with the habit of the population by which they are inclined or disinclined to live in the open or in the town, and, last of all, he asserts that the proportionate number in villages differs in the different sections of the country.

In general, it may be said that in the newer sections of the West, the village and the open country are one. There appears at first no conscious difference between them. In the South, especially as it is under the influence of the Appalachian mountaineer type, the people are averse to town and village life. It is estimated that in the lower Mississippi River states, of four to eight thousand in the community, only one thousand are found in the village. The farmers in the open country in that section have no allegiance to the nearest village but go for trade and social pleasure where their fancy discovers a preference. They are averse to the village. Contrary to this is the habit of Wisconsin, Iowa, Nebraska, and Kansas, where the village is the vital heart of the community life and possesses almost a monopoly of the trade and the attention of the farmers about. For this reason Galpin's *Rural Life* applies most fully to the middle border states, where there is a "superfluity of little towns." It is asserted that there are twice as many towns incorporated in Iowa as in New York.

The details of this inquiry have yet to be worked out. Social study and service, arrested by the World War, will probably in the next decade throw light upon these questions. Meantime, it is evident that the village is

the convenient center of the country community; too convenient in the case of some institutions. The churches, which are sensitive to social habit and population, will gravitate into the villages. Every denomination feels the need of a congregation in each promising town. The ministers found it convenient to live in the growing towns when the country was new and when no one could tell where the houses of worship would be located. There are therefore too many ministers of every Protestant denomination in the village. These men will live where their churches are as soon as the population is settled and the redistribution of land is ended. The churches of the village moreover should combine in at least some of their functions. This also awaits experience. We do not know what the churches and the village will do. They have so far manifested an unwillingness to federate, combine, or cooperate. Churches in the open country and in the cities are obedient to the demand of the times. But the churches of the village are unwilling to yield their convenient location and their supposed "strategic opportunity."

School administrators have debated at length the location of the consolidated school. The more recent opinion is in favor of the village. Nowadays there must be given a strong argument in favor of the location of a consolidated school building in the open country. The burden of proof is in favor of the village.

The dynamic reason for these embarrassments in describing the country community in the terms of the village is the antagonism between dwellers in the open country and dwellers in the village or town. Farmers believe that the village citizens exploit them. They resent the commercial skill, the banking foresight, and

the social pretentiousness of the village people. Very generally they refuse to worship in churches or to attend social gatherings which the village people dominate. Even when they do so attend, there is in the southern sections of the country, even in the Middle West and Northwest a bitter feeling among the farmers, who assert that the village people take to themselves the advantage of their location and do nothing for the farmers to whom the village is a center. This was one of the exciting causes of the Non-Partisan Farmers' League uprising.

The American village is conservative. Generally speaking it is unstirred by the social movement. The villager has been animated by the desire for money. His leisure time is expended in the enjoyment of such luxuries as come to him. The women villagers seek after culture. Requirements of dress and differences of social caste are more imperious in the American village than in the larger cities. There is not yet a profound social movement or development of responsibility among villagers. The agrarian movement in America will oppose the village or dispose of it or seek to dominate it, until the beginnings of a reform of that kind have come.

Recent American books on country life have thrown much light on the village. The books on rural Europe describe the farm, but the sharp point of the American pen is pressed into the flesh of the American village. *Main Street*, by Sinclair Lewis, is a merciless anatomy of the American town which ignores the country people it exploits. *Poor White*, by Sherwood Anderson, is a further description of the futility of the American village life, commercialized, unprincipled, laden with tragedy. We have as yet no American books like *Pelle the Con-*

queror, by Nexo, descriptive of the country life of Denmark, or the *Growth of the Soil*, by Hamsun, which sings the rural epic of a Norwegian farmer.

It is essential that in every community there should be more than one industry by which men may live. It tends to the highest well-being of the community, that is, to its possession of a maximum of vital attraction for individuals, that this industry should supply a variety of sources of income; that is, wages, profits, and interest. If the community can retain in its own bounds the owners of its industries, at least in some numbers, and the capitalists whose wealth is invested in these industries, it is of great service. If it can make life attractive for wage-earners in these industries, the completeness of that community has its testimonial in this variety and wealth of attraction. The weakness of many American communities is shown in their inability to retain within their bounds the owners of the businesses and the employers of labor. The ideal character of some communities in Massachusetts is due to the fact that in the same streets meet there daily capitalists, superintendents, foremen, and wage-earners who are alike interested in the local industries.

This power of the community to attract and hold individual lives, supplying them with the vital necessities for which the individual craves, is dependent in America upon the excellence of its educational institutions. The French philosopher Desmoulin has said that the Anglo-Saxon supremacy is due to the Anglo-Saxon love of the land and of education. The American obeys these two passions, and of the two the love of education is at present the stronger. The community which is weak in its schools will not hold its people.

The generation which at present includes the largest owners of American wealth is eager for educational advantage; and the incoming stream of immigration promises that in the days to come this craving for education will increase.

The country community has been peculiarly weak in its educational facilities, by a strange dulness and inertia due to the prostration of the farming industry. For the two decades following 1880 the country schools have failed to keep pace with the city schools.

The effect of the neglect of the country school, in the face of the constructive statesmanship which has led in perfecting the city school, is seen in the exodus from the country community of very large numbers of the most successful farmers. This exodus from the country community is primarily a quest of educational advantage. Not in every case would the departing family confess that they were seeking better schools; but it is probable that the majority of them, while giving a variety of primary reasons for moving, would assign the desire for education as the uniform secondary reason for departing from the country community.

It is impossible for the country church to retain its ministers. Many reasons enter into this, but always at the top of the list is the desire for better educational opportunities for the ministers' children. It is said that in New England there are three classes of country ministers, and the first of them is the bright young man who will not long be in the country.

The ethical, sometimes called the social factor in the community's life, is no less essential. Organized work requires organized recreation. Every community which has a systematic economy by which its residents get their

living is found to have a systematic though usually informal and unrecognized provision for recreation. Somewhere in the bounds of every working town in America is a playground. It is not the result of "the playground movement," but of the play necessity in human nature. The open lots where the town is not built up, the railroad yard, the yard of a factory, or the town common are used by common consent by the young people and the working people of the town as a playground.

The departure of many persons from country communities is due to the lack of social life; and the fascination of the city for bright and energetic young men and women is a tribute to the variety of recreation and interest which it provides to those who expect to work and are willing to work. Regular work means regular play. This fact cannot be too well learned by those who study the religious and moral life of modern men. The need of play is as real as the need of food or of sleep.

The recreational life is highly ethical. The craving of the young and of working-people for common places of recreation is a normal craving due to the development of conscience as well as to weariness of body. The exactions of modern labor create a craving for free and voluntary movement. Those who are hired to work, and those who if they are employers are bound to the routine of the desk or of the bench, seek to breathe the air of happy and self-expressive action. The result is that play, especially team-work, is highly moral. It is not only personal and self-expressive, but it involves cooperation, self-surrender, obedience, and the correlation of one's own life with other lives in a glorious complex of experiences, unexampled elsewhere in modern life

for their ethical value in developing adolescent minds in the common humanities and moralities. The playground is an essential in the preparation of good citizens, and it is not to be wondered at that in country communities, where all provision of recreation is attended with difficulty and no public provision of playgrounds is thought of by those in authority, young people and working people, indeed all classes of the population, tend to move away.

The religious attraction of the community has just as real a value for the satisfaction of individual life as the economic or ethical or the educational. "Mankind is incurably religious," and the life from birth to death cannot be complete in average cases without religious experience. Indeed, the conscious testimony of men to the communities' religious value for them is greater than any of the others. Religious experience is a form of community consciousness. To many men the church and the community are one. We cannot within our definition grant this; but the testimony to the religious character of the country community is a classic in American thought. The early days of every community are hopeful and optimistic. The tendency has been therefore for each religious communion to establish its own church. These early Protestant churches were expressions of the community sense on behalf of these people. The average American can best think of the community in terms of a church and a school. For building up the community, therefore, the maintenance of religious institutions is essential.

We are concerned in these chapters most of all with the American community in the country. Not because it is important, but because it is easier to understand and

affords a better model for interpreting other communities more complex and highly organized. In it one may see the processes which affect the town and city communities: shifting of population, economic changes, educational improvement or retrogression and the processes of social life which express themselves in moral conditions. The community is the field in which may be observed the prosperity of the people as a whole. It is the local exhibit in which the average man shows what has come to pass throughout the commonwealth as a whole. American rural communities have been under the influence of swift and sudden changes during the years of railroad development.

There is high authority for the statement that the sifting of the country community in recent years has on the whole improved it. Wilbert L. Anderson says, "If this emigration of the best were the whole story, it would be impossible to refute the charge of degeneracy. There is, however, another aspect of the matter. The industrial revolution has put a pressure upon rural life that is more important even than the attraction of cities. That pressure has aggravated the severity of the struggle for existence, and this grinding of the mill of evolution has crushed the weaker strata of the population. Among those who have gone are laborers and their families, the owners and occupants of the poorest lands — the famous abandoned farms — and the weaklings and dependents. Many of these have swollen the crowds of the factory towns; others have supplied unskilled labor to the cities; in not a few cases they have gone to their destruction in the slums, where residues of decadent folk finally disappear. The human material that was most susceptible to alcohol has gone into the mills of the gods.

When all is summed up, the clearance at the bottom is not less significant than the loss at the top of the social scale. Natural selection works as effectually in toning up the species by weeding out the worst as 'natural selection reversed' works for degeneracy through the removal of the best. This purgation has been overlooked. Whether it offsets the injury in the highest stratum is a fair question, but obviously no man is wise enough to answer it. The opinion may be hazarded that when the two influences are compounded, it will be found that the average child has moved but a little way up or down the scale. This is a local question to which there are as many answers as communities. The net result of these changes is a gain in homogeneousness; in the country town the dream of equality is nearer realization today than ever before."[4]

It is the writer's belief that, allowing for local variation, this statement is the best generalization of the condition throughout the country. The rural population has been specialized. The country community is finding its own kind of people. It has not yet, through suitable institutions, learned to cultivate its problems and to train its own leaders. That is precisely what will be accomplished through the building up of the country community with which we are here concerned. But already the country population is homogeneous and is selected with a view to fitness for the environment of the rural community. As the city is breeding its own stock, who are possessed with the problem of city life and devoted to the interests of the city, so the country, in the shifting of modern populations, is coming to have its own kind of people, among whom the

[4] *The Country Town*, by Wilbert L. Anderson, D.D. The Baker Taylor Co., 1906

problems of the country community are beginning to be discussed and the interests of the country community are being provided for by suitable organizations.

The building of communities, therefore, consists of providing the positive agencies needed by the present population in the country. The purpose of those who serve the country population shall be the construction of suitable institutions by which country life shall be made worth while. These institutions must be economic, for the securing of prosperity to country people, social institutions which shall build up their moral character and life, educational institutions whereby the problems of country life shall be understood in the light of all human life, and religious institutions which shall crown the life of country people with hope and animate the individual with the spirit of self-sacrifice on behalf of all the people of the community and of the world.

The church should be a community center. There may be other centers of the community where other functions are assembled, but the church should lift up her eyes to the horizon in which she lives and comprehend all the people in her service and affection. This does not mean that they shall all be members of that church. The church will broaden her field of interest. The community spirit is itself growing. Frequently the country community has attained a unity which the churches ignore. For the church to become a community center means that it represents in itself the united life of the people. Whatever be their common interest, that interest dwells in the church.

VIII

THE MARGIN OF THE COMMUNITY

The center of interest has shifted from the individual to the community. The literature of religious and ethical thought is full of appeal to "serve the community." The working of any religious or ethical force in modern society is conditioned by the closely compact and highly organic character of present-day social life.

In the old times in America, which have so recently gone, men were of one class; the community was homogeneous; universal acquaintance prevailed. The approved type of American life until recent years was the rich man, because we faced a continent unexplored: unpossessed commercial resources were before the people. The standard of the time of Horace Greeley was the standard of individual success, of initial utility. The town boasted of the men it had "turned out." Country schools were described in terms of the persons of distinction who had sat in their seats. The church measured its value by the rich and benevolent farmer or merchant, and by the individuals whose piety or literary success seemed to express the life of the church. There was an opportunity for all, because crude resources, numberless openings offered themselves to every one who had character, industry and brains.

With the twentieth century the American people have become conscious that their resources are numbered. The good free lands of the West are assigned.

The tons of coal under the ground are estimated. The amount of timber, of copper, and of iron still unexploited is known. Public discussion is centered upon the limits set to the growth of the American population and the possibilities of more economical organization of life. We can no longer waste as once we could. The problem now is economy. Instead of the standards of a time of plenty, we are confronted with problems of bare subsistence. The standards by which we measure a man are no longer those of initial utility, but of marginal utility.

In times of plenty, when resources are not yet exhausted, men's lives diverge and the individual is the unit of thought and feeling. The natural result of a time of plenty is the development and the endowment of personality. But in times when a bare subsistence is the condition with which many are confronted, men are drawn together and the community becomes the unit of thought and feeling. Industry as it matures brings men together. It becomes evident that they depend upon one another.

Men who in a time of plenty would seek an independent fortune are contented, under conditions of bare subsistence, to secure employment and to become dependent upon others. The problems of subsistence open opportunities for exploitation, and the stronger become related to great numbers of weaker members of the community. Thus men's lives are compacted and the conditions out of which thought and feeling arise are social conditions rather than individual.

The country community under these circumstances rises into new significance. In the early pioneer days the country community was much in thought and feel-

ing, because then men, seeking a bare subsistence in the contest with nature, were forced into close associations for the sake of protection. This consciousness was lost as soon as the pioneer days were past and the abundance of nature began to enrich mankind instead of antagonizing him. Now, again, the country community has come into prominence because men are confronted with a struggle to maintain an acceptable standard of living.

In dealing with a social whole, to accomplish a purpose one must deal with it in social terms. Social service is not quantitative, but qualitative. Ministry to a community is not uniformly applied to all the members. In social service there is no such thing as equality of all the population. The differing values of men in a social population are determined, as other values are measured, by the working of the law of diminishing returns.

Roughly stated, this law is that successive additions of any valued thing bring ever diminished returns. The first quantity of anything is of infinite value. For later increments the value is measureable, and ever less with the increase in the supply; until a portion is supplied on the margin between value and indifference. The application of this law in economics is stated as follows by Professor John Bates Clark:

"Labor, as thus applied to land, is subject to a law of diminishing returns. Put one man on a quarter section of land, containing prairie and forest, and he will get a rich return. Two laborers on the same ground will get less per man; three will get still less; and, if you enlarge the force to ten, it may be that the last man will get wages only.

"Modern studies of value show that doses of con-

sumer's goods, given in a series to the same person, have less and less utility per dose. The final utility theory of value rests on the same principle as does the theory of diminishing returns from agriculture, and this principle has a far wider range of new applications.

" The richer man becomes, the less can his wealth do for him. Not only a series of goods that are all alike, but a succession of units of wealth itself, with no such limitation on its forms, becomes less and less useful per unit. Give to a man not coats, but ' dollars,' one after another, and the utility of the last will still be less than that of any other. The early dollars feed, clothe, and shelter the man, but the last one finds it hard to do anything for him." [1]

By this law successive deposits of immigrants and successive gains in the American population are reducing the valuation of men for religious, moral, and educational use. The first man in any historic experience is of infinite value. The first American, Columbus, will be famous forever, but not because of any talents or enterprise of his. As a matter of fact he blundered into discovering America and died ignorant of the feat he had actually accomplished. But because he was the first white man on a new continent he had infinite historical value. When the early Europeans were increased to ten or to one thousand each of them entered into fame, though men like John Smith were commonplace enough in their performances. Their fame is measurable, but still great. When the number of Americans was increased to eight millions every one thought himself, because the greatness of the new country was then appreciated, a great citizen, the founder of a family and

[1] *The Distribution of Wealth*, by John Bates Clark.

a potential millionaire. Those were still the days of exceptional personality. The type of man in those times was the landowner, the pioneer, and the statesman.

But now there are one hundred and five million Americans, all the valuable lands are assigned, all the best positions are filled, every job is taken, and millions of the population are concerned about the problems of daily bread. These millions are the marginal Americans. They are breadwinners, and the breadwinner is the unit of value on whom the standard of American social and religious life is measured. So far as there can be an American type on whom policies in public life are measured, that type is today the breadwinner. In the city the breadwinner is a working man or an immigrant. In the country the marginal man is a tenant farmer, or a working farmer, though he be the owner. The marginal man exhibits the value of all men in the community.

The law of diminishing returns works in the factory for fixing the wages in any scale which prevails throughout a level of pay. It is equally efficient in leveling men in the community. The employer does not pay the working man in accordance with the value of the few brilliant, trusty, or inventive men in that group, but he pays each man just that wage which he must offer to the last man he hires. The marginal man standardizes the wage. The values of men in the community are standardized not upon the brilliant or saintly or accomplished, not upon the well-to-do members of the community, but upon the poor who are just able to stand and maintain themselves in the life of that community.

The working of this law is not a matter of persuasion. It is the inflexible condition with which religious and

ethical institutions are confronted. Churches should, therefore, estimate their policies by the responses of the marginal people of the community. Religious standards of value should be measured by final utility, not initial utility. The complaint against the church today is reducible to this: that she standardizes her ideals and her policies in accordance with the estimated need and demands of the prosperous and well-to-do. The eloquence and the character of her ministers, the kind of music with which God is worshiped, the comfortable pews, the carpets on the floor, are all of them unlike those found in the public hall which is supported by the dues of the poor. The taste expressed in church matters is rather literary and esthetic than popular. The church which would appeal to the whole community must standardize her work upon the poor man, and make her appeal to him.

The principle is not only scientifically correct, but it works out in practice. A minister who came into a well-organized country community, where there were a few land-holders, many tenants, and numbers of farm hands, found that the only appeal by which the whole community could be reached was an appeal directed to the marginal people in the community. When he sought the tenant farmer, he secured with him the land-holder, and when he went after the hired man on the farm, he secured the farmer who employed him. When he gained the adherence of the boys and girls, he secured the support of their parents; and when he rendered service to little children, he could safely rely upon the gratitude and loyalty of their mothers and fathers.

This was the kind of work which Jesus did. He frankly made a selection of the people to whom he should

minister.[2] He knew no phrases about all men being equal, and he made no profession of impartiality such as today causes many ministers to loiter among the well-to-do, who care not for them. Jesus said he had no time to spend with well people, because he was sent to the sick. But the philosophy of his action was seen in the fact that when he ministered to the sick he helped the well. He "preached the gospel to the poor," but not because he had any noticeable prejudice against the rich. By ministering to the poor, he applied his gospel to the margin of the community. That gospel has been of equal value to the rich man, because the spiritual experiences of the poor are the experiences also of the rich. The modern minister who goes after rich men specifically, or who goes after them with the same vigor with which he seeks the poor, will receive but a grudging welcome. But if he awakens the gratitude and support of the poor, he will find himself sought by the rich, and sustained by their abundant gifts.

Mr. Gilbert K. Chesterton, the English critic, has somewhere finely said that the Master in his words to Simon Peter, "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church," clearly recognized that Peter was a shuffler and a weakling and a coward: it was upon just such common material that the church was founded. It was not to be an aristocratic organization. Its foundations were not laid upon skill and genius in human character, but upon the weaker, commonplace traits which universal mankind possesses.

So definite was the appeal of Jesus to the marginal people of his time, that he has been twice criticized unjustly; once in his own time by the Pharisees, and

[2] Luke 6: 20; 15; 1ff.

again in our time by the Socialists. The latter have claimed that Jesus was " class conscious," that he was a partisan of the poor, a proletarian radical. The bias of Socialism is displayed in this comment upon Jesus. His appeal was to the whole community, as through Christian history his message has come uniformly to men of all degrees, rich and poor, ignorant and learned, bad and good. The religious genius of Jesus is shown in the fact that he recognized what the Socialist does not, that to appeal to the whole community a prophet must address his plea to the people on the margin of the community. His measure of value must be that of final utility.

One may go at large into this tempting field in illustrations. The artistic experience of mankind is abundant in illustration of it. The beauty of the ocean is in its shores — the margin of the boundless expanse. Literary descriptions of the experiences of human love are made of descriptions of the margins of love. Married life is depicted in courtship, and the sentiments of affection are described in scenes of parting and meeting, which are the margins of companionship. Contemporary writers about love describe the peril or the breakdown of married union. The stage appeals to lovers in representations not of calm, normal married life, but of its dangers and its failures.

This principle should be fundamental in programs of reconstruction of ethical institutions. In the training of men for ethical leadership they should be accustomed to think in terms of communal wholes, and this thinking will use as its units of measure the characteristics of the marginal life. It is for this reason that temperance reform in America has been so influential within the past

three decades. It is a communal form of ethics. It demands that the community should act together in safeguarding the weaker members of the community, the intemperate, the young men, and the working people. The old temperance propaganda was individualistic. It recorded its results in the number of persons who signed the pledge. Its results were as gratifying if the pledges were signed by well-doing and orderly people as if they were signed by drunkards. The modern temperance movement draws its influence from its proposed effect upon the agricultural laborer and the railroad hand.

The theological seminary of the past has been a literary institution. During the period of its development the typical Christian was the bright and aspiring young man in a community of boundless resources. To such a man books are the interpreters of life. But in the modern period with the congested population and close social organization, human fellowship is an experience of greater value to most men than books. Since the time of the invention of printing successive quantities of literature have been given to the world, and under the law of diminishing returns literature has come to have very small returns for many. At the time of the Protestant Reformation the initial value of books in the hands of the common people was infinite. For several generations along with the extension of universal education this supreme value of books continued for the people on the margin of the educated world. But nowadays everybody in American progressive communities can read and write; and in a universally educated population we arrive at the final utility of books in human use. Great masses of poor people and also many people of

means use books within narrow limits only. They do not buy them, they do not read them, they do not think in literary terms. They have access to books and they turn from them with a clear sense of intelligent preference for other human values. Books are to them but an alphabet; social life is the story.

The life of the marginal man is social rather than literary. His religion will be a social religion rather than a Biblical religion. The weakness of Protestantism is that it stubbornly insists upon literary interpretation of God and upon a Biblical ministry, while the population around these Protestant churches exemplifies the diminished value of literature for spiritual uses.

The religious and ethical thought of the days to come must interpret the social life of the people. The great mass of the people care as little for wealth as they do for books. The same argument as to the diminished returns of literature may be repeated to describe the diminished returns of private property. The economic revolution since feudal days has exhausted the values of private property in satisfying human need. The time was when property had an infinite value for expressing personality. In days to come private property will still have this value for many individuals. But among common folks generally private property does not seem to have boundless value for human satisfaction. Working men as I have known them do not take pains to get rich. They know the way to wealth by economy and accumulation, but they do not take it. They have a vast preference for the social intercourse, friendly interchanges, and mutual dependence by which their life is refreshed, strengthened and sustained. Ethical policies of the future, while using literature and private property as

efficient implements, must interpret social life itself as a flowing spring of religion and morality.

Medieval education was for the few persons of initial utility; modern education is for marginal people. In those times the learned man was the objective in education; now the child, the illiterate, the Negro, or the Indian adult, the criminal or the foreigner, are the marginal types upon whose education the attention of the whole people is concentrated.

We are educating in the interest of the community, that is, the whole population; we therefore bestow our efforts upon the child-margin of the community, where the conditions common to all are found. By educating the criminal we serve all sober, well-behaved persons. Besides, we learn from the criminal something that enables us to understand the sober citizen, and to educate him better. Hampton and Tuskegee, the schools for Negroes, are observed closely by college presidents because they are of marginal, that is universal, value in education, whereas the old-time colleges, being designed for the education of leaders, that is, persons of initial utility, are in danger of doing a work more quaint than it is representative. The public schools themselves are for universal use. After some initial experiments with tuition from some who could pay, these schools were made free to all. They accepted the poor child as their standard child, being confident that his needs would be the needs of the rich child. The opposite would not have been true. So the public schools, being schools for marginal persons, must minister to the marginal types of mentality. Of recent years we hear of tests of mentality and measurements of attainment, of defectives and of retarded pupils. The teacher of all the children of an

age and grade must find her usual child in the marginal young mind. The problem then arises of defining that margin. What level of intelligence can be accepted as the standard? It is not an average mind, nor a mean intellect, nor a modal type the school administrator seeks. He does not want a pacemaker: the bright child may skip grades. Universal education must find a marginal, that is, an endurable, available, usable type of child upon whose capacity to be taught the process of teaching may be standardized.

We see in this problem how empty is the boast of some country schools of the one-teacher type, now admittedly stale and worn out, that they once "turned out" statesmen, clergymen of note, and industrial giants. These exceptional persons indeed learned to read in the roadside school, but no more; after that they "skipped grades." The public school is not maintained for persons of initial utility. The real test of a public school is its service to the public; and that service is registered in its usefulness to marginal persons. To define and to know well the marginal child in each grade is the first task in the organization of classes, departments, and curricula.

The question of the education of sub-marginal minds, unavailable, incapable of taking their place among children, probably deficient for life, is a minor problem, though of exceeding interest. So is the problem of educating brilliant children. Society is in danger of placing too high value upon these sensational adventures. The one is worth while as a defense of the community against the blunders of the moron; the other justifies itself because its schools furnish the leaders of the community. But probably the social value of them both

has been exaggerated. It would be cheaper and wiser for society to intrust the moron to a kind of intelligent police, and to intrust the education of leaders to private schools. Probably leaders would lead better if they were self-educated anyway. The public funds should be concentrated upon that education which is of assured use to all, namely, the schooling of the marginal children of the first six grades. The teachers of these children are the community educators. They should have the public honors, the highest salaries, the greatest privileges.

Transformations are in these days wrought in health work, by those who follow the principle of the service of marginal persons. Not three decades ago the doctors confined their attention to the sick. Now they recite the triumphs of public health work. The older type of bedside service was individual. The later is a service of the whole community. But the servant of the community waits upon patients or "cases," who are at some one of the marginal experiences. They serve in investigations, or direct quarantine, or conduct trench-warfare upon filth. By such means the danger from tuberculosis has been reduced, not by the doctor who carries his work bag from door to door, nor by the specialist in the office beyond the crowded waiting-room. They heal the patient — or at least comfort him. Be thankful for that! But the healing of society's diseases awaits the worker who takes no man's fee but works upon those marginal cases in whose healing all the community may be made well.

So morality is being improved. Not by denouncing or even by advising the misdoer; but by providing a technique of recreation, an ordered method of play, a

school of joyous social behavior. All the preachers and denouncers know that play is the marginal field of conduct, — full of mischief as life is of sin. Play is fertile in naughtiness as civilization is productive of crimes. The social worker therefore sets about improving play, inspiring it, dignifying it with noble buildings, broad outdoor areas, cool swimming-places, ingenious devices for camping; and above all the worker puts himself into the game. It is the belief of our generation that on the playground, which is the shadowy margin of real life, moral conduct, good manners, wholesome thoughts and desires, vigorous purposes become habitual. By sublimated play we built up the morale of four million civilian soldiers and made them fit to fight. The conduct of men in cities is to a great degree moulded in places of recreation. The behavior of students in universities is almost wholly directed by playground and gymnasium. For artificial life like that of a city, a model factory town or a great university, the true moral direction is rendered in the marginal experiences of play. Criminals among these artificial populations do excessive harm. Saints are too few to be known; their weight is little. The technique of ethical control is worked out in the forms of recreation.

In the same way the economic welfare of country people has been improved by attention to the organizing of the people who are in economic jeopardy. Sir Horace Plunkett has enriched Ireland, not by attempts to increase the great fortunes of the rich. He has organized since 1889 over 100,000 Irish farmers who were on the verge of poverty into cooperatives by the devising of unions in which they can collectively do business. Thus men are enabled to engage in wholesale trade who afore-

time ventured into that market at their peril. An effect has been an enrichment of all the people of Ireland. Even the bankers and merchants for whose prosperity no direct efforts are made, are wealthier because the Irish Organization Society devoted itself to the penniless farmer.[3]

The purpose of this chapter is to say that the service of the whole community is best rendered in efforts on behalf of its marginal persons. This is not to deny that initiative and the purpose to serve comes from persons of initial utility. We cannot expect leadership from marginal minds. The power to create, the motive to serve, the discernment of the way of service here described, may all be forbidden to marginal persons. They are given to those of highest value, the men and the women privileged by birth, education, or the possession of property. The artistic instinct is very rare; so is the prophetic inspiration, the farmer's urge, the pastor's passion, the pitiful heart of this worker among the poor. It is not contended that these traits are marginal. They are the most precious inheritances of great families. To others they are God-given, like genius. The field for that genius to work in, on behalf of all the people of a community, is seen in the condition of the marginal man of the community, the man who is in jeopardy.

The training of religious and ethical leaders should be undertaken in the theological seminary and in the university in such manner as to standardize the influence of these institutions by the life, not of the exceptional man, but of the common man. The influence of educated men must be used to reconstruct churches and societies, not upon the standards of the wealthy, the learned, the

[3] *Rural Reconstruction in Ireland*, by Smith-Gordon and Staples. P. S. King & Co., London.

genius, and the well-to-do, but by the experiences of the poor, the working man and the immigrant. The standard in all religious and ethical institutions which profess to represent the community is today graded up to the professional and exceptional. The reconstruction necessary is to grade down so that the appeal shall be to the poor and struggling man whose condition is in jeopardy, whose status in the community is as yet undetermined. Institutions which appeal to the community as a whole must standardize their policy to the level of the margin of the community.

The reconstruction of the theological seminaries is necessary, if they are to fit men for service in communities. They render now a service which is so valuable that one cannot pass over them lightly. They train the candidate for the ministry by a process which develops and engages his piety. Other university courses either ignore his religious feeling, or, if they develop it, do not harness it to the task of social improvement. The theological seminary lays the yoke of service upon the neck of prayer. This alone justifies its existence as a servant of the church. However, the instruction in the seminary, though adapted in places, is still grouped around courses in dead languages to the exclusion of instruction in living conditions. The history of discarded doctrines and of discredited teachers is minutely taught through months, to the exclusion of courses upon modern, living people, whose religious experience is rich and striking. The purpose of seminary instruction is polemic skill, sectarian usefulness, personal culture instead of religious efficiency. It is the theory of the teachers wherein they disagree with all other professional teachers, that — "We do not make preachers:

the Lord makes them." They try therefore to impart culture and personal distinction.

The seminaries need first of all flexibility of courses. The whole traditional schedule should in all seminaries be made elective as it is in some. The demands of the time would then have free course in the seminary. The students would by free choice of instructors abolish useless courses and chairs and would rearrange the instruction according to actual present need. The cultivation of practical piety should receive more attention. The social life of the students, in close association with their professors and under religious stimuli, should be made a more powerful force than it usually is, in creating a common ideal of service to which the seminary should commit itself. Above all, the seminary of theology should teach sociology and economics as an interpretation of the sources of religious life and feeling. Students should, after a year's class-room work, be made to investigate and report upon actual conditions, should be delegated to study social movements, report upon them, and to lead in discussing them. They should be trained in the use of statistics, in graphic display of conditions, and in the use of public reports. In the senior year they should be employed definitely in practical work for populations, under instructors. After graduation the young minister should, more generally than now, be employed as an assistant to an older minister, in a large organization.

The influence of such social training would itself reform seminary instruction. Thrust into a present-day curriculum, social science is a foreign and alien intruder; but in a curricuum of elective courses its value would soon be demonstrated and other courses would be made

over in new harmony with it. If some courses be dropped, even if whole chairs be abandoned, it is better than that the whole theological seminary be abandoned by students — which is the apparent fate hanging over certain seminaries! What has here been said is true of the schools of theology in all denominations, and applies alike to both the conservative and the liberal.

In conclusion, the writer believes that the church's future is with the self-respecting poor. Jesus and nearly every leader of a great religious movement was of the poor and labored with the poor. The sources of religion are those named in the Beatitudes: poverty, meekness, sorrow, hunger, ostracism; and those are all social experiences. The service of the church should be to these; and in serving the marginal people, whose life is composed of the Beatitudes, the church will serve all men.

IX

PUBLIC HEALTH

The first reason for concern about rural health is the higher standard of living, which has come along with the exploitation of farm lands, the growth of cities, and discontent with former conditions. This higher standard is one of the features of the period of husbandry into which country life is passing. As the women in the country are the interpreters of the wants, so they are the ones to demand better health conditions. They are sensitive to the needs of better living. The desire to enjoy health service not known to the household farmer is, as a rule, expressed in terms of improvement in the life of the women.

In consequence of the higher standard of living, or at least as a correlative of it, there are fewer children born in the country. Families are smaller and a higher value is set upon the life of every one. When there were ten children in the family, it was taken for granted that not more than five would survive and grow up. Now that less than two is the rule, the life of every one is precious. Women shrink from the perils of bearing children and they are not complacent at thought of the death of any whom they have borne. In New York State this is seen in the small size of the families found in the Survey of Tompkins County by Cornell University in 1908. The average household group was less than four in number. Since this average included farm hands it is obvious that there was not more than one child per family living at home in that county in that

year. In Lancaster County, Pennsylvania, in the same decade, farmers were alarmed at the many instances of childlessness in cases of old families of American stock. Almost equally alarming was the frequency of very small families. They realized that their own way of life was not perpetuating itself. This condition is general among the rural people of the Colonial States and is increasingly common among all the American stock in the country and city. Whatever may be its general meaning, we believe that the recognition of it has set a higher value on the health of individuals and of communities.

A curious reason for health discussion has been influential in the minds of many. The care of pure-bred stock by the State and National Departments of Agriculture has reached a high point of technical skill and practical extension. In consequence many speakers and writers have commented upon the contrast between the government's care of the horse, the cow, or the hog, and the neglect by government of the boy or girl or woman on the farm. This reason, which is a superficial one, has served to engage many minds. In a time of rural discontent it has probably had great weight with legislators and reformers.

Another superficial reason has been widely quoted. Health service in the cities is better than that of the country. In contrast to the traditional belief statistics show that the death rate, while declining in the cities, is either rising or standing still so far as the country people are concerned. In the State of New York, Dr. Thomas D. Wood [1] has shown that the falling death

[1] Second Edition of *Health Essentials of Rural Children*, Report of Joint Committee of National Education Association and American Medical Association. Thomas D. Wood, M.D., Chairman: also *Health Charts* by the same.

rate for New York City has recently met and crossed the rural death rate, which is horizontal. He has proclaimed that it is as healthy to live in the city as it is in the country. This statement widely quoted has served to awaken interest in the conditions of rural health.

More important than any other reason, though less widely advertised, is the withdrawal of the professional classes from the country, especially of the physician and trained nurse. Indeed, the nursing profession was never extended among country people. The profession of graduate nurse is so recent that the cities themselves have not been sufficiently served. Their demand not being yet satisfied, the people dwelling on the land and in the villages have not enough nurses to make a showing. In Hunterdon County, New Jersey, within one hundred miles of the biggest city, there was in 1917 less than one-half a nurse for the whole county; that is, a woman was employed in an industrial plant for one-half her time, the remainder of her time being at the disposal of the public. In meeting the needs of public health service the trained nurse is probably of greater importance than the physician. Lack of graduate nurses in the country is, therefore, keenly felt. The knowledge of their skill and usefulness has gone everywhere, awakening a discontent among all who dwell in the country, because they are deprived of service essential to reasonable enjoyment of health.

As to physicians, the withdrawal of the medical profession from a relation to the occupation of farming has been startling in its suddenness. It is nowadays one of the acknowledged hardships of country living that "it is too far from a doctor." Probably this fact is a heavy weight in the scale when men and their families

decide to move from the open country into the town. The fact is that in the household farm period before 1870 there were physicians in various parts of the country and the farmer had his reasonable share of medical practitioners near at hand. At that time there were lawyers and ministers living in the country as well who have since gone to the town. There is special reason for the concentration of men of the medical profession in the towns and cities. The practice of medicine has been undergoing rapid transformation. Since 1870 it has indeed been revolutionized. It is still adjusting itself to discoveries in biology, chemistry, and related sciences. The man who would maintain himself as a physician, therefore, must be near the schools, not far from a hospital, and he must also have opportunity for discussion with other members of his profession. The great cities and industrial centers offer these opportunities. Their congested populations, engaged in the great industries, provide a sufficient number of cases to occupy the trained physicians, to employ them, and to reward them. The wealth of the country has been concentrated during the past fifty years in these large centers, so that hospitals, clinics, asylums for the insane, and laboratories for investigation have been made possible. Only slowly is hospital service penetrating the rural sections.

In the country and village, on the contrary, the number of patients is by comparison smaller. They are dispersed over a wide area, because farming is an occupation of dispersion, not of concentration, and by comparison with the cities country places are lacking in capital and in income. The farmer cannot pay the large fees because his income is small and those who enjoy a large income from agricultural production do not live in

the country. Agricultural wealth, as other wealth, is concentrated in the cities. The State of Virginia is predominantly agricultural. Two-thirds of the people of the State live in rural communities where the centers of population are less than 2,500; but among the people in the cities of Virginia, less than one-third of the population of the State, there are nine times as many physicians as there are among the rural population. It is probable that the concentration of trained nurses in the city is even greater.

The conditions of health peculiar to the country, which arise out of the changed country life, are not a higher mortality or a greater suffering from the diseases of which record is made. The best students of rural public health do not record a higher death rate or greater morbidity among country people. Neither in the diseases related to typhoid, nor in diphtheria, scarlet fever, measles, — epidemics of which are so common in the country, — nor in any group save one, do country people suffer in excess over people in the cities. In the influenza group of diseases, which affect the respiratory tract, there is an excessive rural showing. But on the whole the peculiar condition to be met in the country is not a higher death rate or a higher disease rate. It is in the prevalence of small and weakening maladies that country people suffer most. " With minor ailments the rural communities are sadly overwhelmed." One who goes into the country from the city will observe a lower tone of physical happiness, a depressed morale and slower pace, a lack of joy and adventure. This physical depression appears at its worst in the older and more backward communities where it is the polite and proper thing to " enjoy poor health." There no one acknowl-

edges himself or herself to be well, but the ideal state is expressed in the word "poorly." This means that country life in its industrial and social processes is depressed. There is lack of efficiency, of joy, of heartiness, in the country. City people, because they are cared for by so many skilled professional workers, enjoy life, a high efficiency, and an abounding energy. This elation of mind and body is a product of the care of the family physician, the dentist, the trained nurse, the specialist. There are other contributors to it, but the production of this efficiency, which reaches its highest point in the well-groomed, well-conditioned business man, is the care of the family physician and specialist. None of this care is today enjoyed by the people who dwell on the farms or in the open country.

A second condition of depressed life in the country is the poor cooking which, in spite of a tradition to the contrary, prevails among farmers and villagers. Not every housewife inherits the traditional skill of which we read so often. Most country women fry their food too much and use in the process an excess of grease. Even in the households which enjoy the good name of generations of good feeding, there is no knowledge of modern dietetics, which with scrupulous care is advising the cook and housewife.

Like the indigestible cooking is the poor ventilation of the household and the lack of bathing facilities. There is a difference of testimony as to how many country homes have modern plumbing. Too few surveys have been made as yet to furnish a basis of generalization. But records so far made show that in prosperous counties not one farmhouse in ten has a bathtub, and not one in twenty has an indoor toilet. The conditions

of health are most affected by the prevailing and usual rather than by the exceptional. Therefore, in these matters, the people on the farms and in the small villages are at a great disadvantage. The want of these things has not arisen. The commercial supply of them has not been offered to the farmer and the villager. Nor is the farmer's income yet sufficient to install better ventilation and better plumbing.

Farming is an industrialized way of life. Those who live on the farm nowadays are there because they get their living there. The people who live in the villages and small towns are there for a similar, practical reason. So industrial accidents of agriculture are common throughout the whole population in the country. Farming is a strenuous and difficult occupation. Many of the activities are carried on under excessive strain. The workers in the field and the woman in the farmhouse have hard labor to perform. They have heavy loads to lift, sudden crises to meet, and work to do, hard in its stress, sudden in its exigencies. The result is that the farmer is constantly suffering from accident and hurt. He needs near at hand the care of a skilled and competent person who will mend his hurts and save him from permanent disablement; at least from industrial injury and loss of time. His physician is too far away and the nurse who could give aid in emergency is still unknown in most country places.

But the chief reason for special health service in the country is a characteristic condition which the farmer shares with the workers of no other industry. This reason is soil pollution. Unlike the sheep or the cow, which can be moved to another pasture, the human being must live at one spot, and yet like all animals man

tends to pollute the soil by excretion of intestinal parasites, which spend a part of their cycle of life in the soil or in vegetable matter. The farmer who has a flock of sheep moves them to another pasture to " rest the land." His real reason is that when sheep are removed for a time from the pasture the parasites die for lack of opportunity to return to the body of the sheep in which they spend a part of their life. The human being living at one place pollutes the soil to the point of danger, unless special scientific care is taken for the destruction of these bacteria or parasites which cause disease.

In 1911–13 the United Public Health Service Bureau made a survey of fifteen counties in fourteen different states of the Union distributed as widely as the State of Washington and the State of South Carolina, as far apart as Illinois and Mississippi. This survey was published as Health Bulletin No. 94. It is a great contribution to our knowledge of the typhoid group of diseases, their conditions and their remedy. Incidental to this study Dr. Lumsden, who was in charge, was able to record the conditions which prevail throughout the United States and to make a general exhibit of the healthfulness of the people who live in the country; for this was a survey of farm and village homes. It was the first rural health study of so general a character. But it confirms the findings in other local studies, such as the survey of twelve counties in Indiana made by Dr. J. N. Hurty, Secretary of the State Board of Health, in the same decade.

Dr. Lumsden reported that " the sanitary conditions in the rural districts generally of the United States are grossly faulty and seriously in need of correction."

In the 51,544 homes surveyed only 1.22 per cent were equipped for sanitary disposal of human excreta; and in

68 per cent the family water supply was exposed to this pollution. The percentage of homes without any toilets whatever varied from 11 per cent in one state to 74 per cent in another. Dr. Lumsden noticed that many of these farmhouses were protected by lightning-rods! In general the survey is a terrible indictment of the communities which produce and send forth the food to all the nation.

Soil pollution is so characteristic a danger among those who live on farms, a danger even greater among those who live in villages, that it requires a special form of service and makes necessary a fit organization of public health. The danger with which we have to contend is that both country and city people shall be weakened by the diseases of uncleanness. The very thought of these maladies awakens disgust. The knowledge that we suffer from them so widely is humiliating. The fact that they can be remedied and that we have only to organize social control with thoroughness to abate them is a challenge to our citizenship. The danger is that between city and country the typhoid group of diseases will be transmitted. In 1922 Dr. Royal S. Coapland of the Board of Health in New York City warned those in charge of summer encampments for boys and girls that they must obey the rules of the Board of Health in the organization and management of their camps, in order to prevent the importation of typhoid from country places into the city. The carriers of the diseases resultant from soil pollution are the following: first, farm products, such as milk, vegetables, and fruit, which have been handled by country people who may be infected; second, insects — among which are flies, mosquitoes, fleas, or lice; third, the persons of those who travel from

the country to the city or from the city to the country; fourth, the city water.

Inasmuch as we have no prospect of abolishing the farm or modifying the mode of those who live in the country, so far as the effects of the industry are concerned, we must face the conditions of health and plan the remedy of these evils. From a sanitary point of view the higher standards of modern life demand that the farmhouse and the village residence be made clean in the interest of those who dwell there and of those who buy the product of the farm. City and country are so closely related by reason of marketing and of the visiting back and forth, that the whole of modern life depends for its healthfulness upon the sanitary condition of the rural community.

The schools and churches should themselves be demonstrations of sanitary care. The schoolhouse is declared by the United States Bureau of Education to be the chief center of the infection by hookworm. Other rural diseases are communicated through the contacts of school and church. There should be then at every schoolhouse either sanitary privies for protecting the soil, or, in those communities that can afford it, a modern sewage disposal system with septic tank out of doors underground, whereby the wastes may be returned in harmless form to the soil again.

The other crying defect of country life is the presence in the country population of many persons who are ill born. We have come to realize in recent years that many of the defects from which men suffer are inheritable. Dr. Harris in *Health on the Farm* gives a list of ten defects from which the individual suffers. It is striking to observe that these are nearly all of such character that the community is sure to suffer with the

individual. They are — feeblemindedness, inebriety, pauperism, criminality, epilepsy, insanity, asthenia, various diatheses, deformity, sense-defect.

Studies are being made which show that in certain states, though not in all sections of them, the country population contains an abnormal proportion of those who are born to trouble and to retard the community. In southern Ohio there are counties in which congenital defects are associated with illiteracy, immorality and emotional religion, so as to produce alarming results. Rev. C. O. Gill in the Ohio Rural Life Surveys has discovered the coincidence of these anti-social conditions. Dr. Wilhelmine Key has published for the Society for the Care of the Feeble Minded in Philadelphia a study of the presence in a certain Pennsylvania population of a high proportion of mental defectives. Assuming that there is present in a normal population about one per cent of persons mentally defective, it will be discovered by investigation that some country populations have an alarming proportion of those whose stupidity, immorality and even criminal tendency lays a heavy burden upon the rest of the community.

The reason for this is apparently to be found in the sifting process which has taken out of the country so many of the strong and capable. The migrations of recent years have offered inducements to persons who possess the very traits which the country community now needs. The carriers of these traits have gone to the West, to Alaska, and to the cities. The residual population in the country contains those unattracted by ambition, by adventure, or by industrial opportunity; so that there are too many of them in the country that have reproduced their own inefficiency in their children, by

reason of the fact that the causes of the inefficiency are inherited.

The study of heredity is of recent years. Although we know but a few things we know them beyond dispute. The Monk Mendel, whose story is well told in Punnet's *Mendelism*, has proven for all time that heredity is by individuals and that each person is a composite of many inheritable factors. The germ-plasm mysteriously, but with precision and inflexible order, transmits through him from his ancestor to his descendants the traits which are his inheritance. These unit characters are not changed by environment nor by education; though, of course, they may be affected by these media in any one generation. We recognize these in our care of the lower animals and vegetables by seed-testing for the improvement of corn, cow-testing for the improvement of dairy cattle, and trap-nesting for increasing the production of eggs. Doctors Fisher and Fiske in the book *How to Live* assert that in the same way musical, artistic, literary, and mechanical ability are inherited, just as the color of the eyes is inherited. They state that by inviolable laws now known piousness, independence, industry, joviality, hospitality, and the love of land, are qualities that are inherited. If this be true the sifting out of country people in recent years explains the lack in many country communities of musical, artistic, literary, and mechanical ability. It explains in part the decline of the country church and the absence of play, recreation, and organized fun among country people. Even the statement that the love of land is inherited will, if it is true, be a part of the explanation of the increasing farm tenancy in the rural section of the population. In any case the study of the processes of

heredity, especially of selective breeding, has value for the cattle-breeder. It may illuminate problems of both the physical and intellectual life of men.

A word should be said about rural epidemics. Every one who lives in the country knows how dreaded are their outbreaks. They strike suddenly without warning and their effect is widely felt. They paralyze school, church, and social life. They reduce the efficiency of industrial life. They lower the whole tone of life in the country. Not until there is a trained nurse in supervision of every school in the country can there be even a program made which will relieve this condition. The remedy is at present out of sight so far as state laws or administration are concerned. I am mentioning it here only to say that the health of the country community is dependent upon the weakest member. The family in which unclean living is the rule controls the health conditions of the whole community. It is in vain for one household to be clean and sanitary if the children from it go to school, the adults to church and lodge, and all the members of the family to the store. For at these centers contagions are possible and infections are transmitted. In other words, the country community has a common problem of health.

The remedy for these conditions is to be found in health service adjusted to modern life. We need a health service suitable to the present-day community. The teeming and populous household of the early nineteenth century is past. Exacting and refined wants cause discontent. Every one in the country wants to live well, efficiently, and happily. Yet the trained physicians and other specialists who make this possible are not at hand. We believe that a radical program of

health service must be considered. It is obvious that the system of fees by which the physician and the nurse are paid are inadequate to the needs of country life. So long as profits of modern industry, including farming, are concentrated in the cities, it will be impossible for farmers and villagers, with whom remains as a rule a share of the profit too small for comfortable living, to compete with the people in the cities in hiring personal service. The doctor on his part, and the specialist even more, must ask a high price for his skill. His preparation is costly; he naturally expects to demand a high fee in return for it. He knows no way to repay himself for his outlay in courses of study, laboratory equipment and professional tools other than that he now employs: — a heavy charge upon service to the rich; and for the poor — charity! Of these alternatives the one is impossible for the farmer and the other is objectionable.

There are only three alternatives to the fee system by which men secure under conditions of industrialization the medical care they need. The first is charity, the second is endowment, and the third is state support. Granting that in many places the old system of medical service sustained by fees is to remain in use, we believe that adequate provision for rural public health service can be had only by combination of private endowment and support by the state out of taxation. So far as charity is concerned, the readers of this book would not willingly entertain the idea of any industry being dependent on charity, least of all that of farming. No part of the population is so proud and self-reliant as the farmer. We cannot for the moment consider charity as a remedy for the conditions of rural health. There will always be a range for private and public charity in caring for the few

paupers who have fallen behind in the race. Human waste must be conserved and put out of sight in poor-houses, asylums, and other institutions under the care of charity. But in this process there is no remedy for the health needs of a self-reliant, home-making people.

Public endowment is now rendering a very great service in the care of public health. Those Americans who have been enriched beyond their needs are disposed to return to the commonwealth a share of their wealth. The great Foundations contribute largely to our knowledge of social conditions and to the beginnings of the service necessary. A good example is the investigation of hookworm disease by the General Education Board, commonly called The Rockefeller Foundation. After the discovery of the condition from which so many people under the Southern sun suffered, this great Foundation initiated the service to be carried on later by the state; then the Foundation withdrew its hand and transferred the expenditure of its funds to other fields, believing that it was best for the public to pay out of taxation for service which the public was enjoying. It is the belief of the present writer that from some Southern States the Foundation withdrew too soon. This withdrawal was animated doubtless by many reasons, among which was a belief in the state as the most efficient agent of public service. In this belief we do not share. Private initiative, the sense of pity, which is given in excess to some persons alone, and the wisdom in administration which not all public officials have, are necessary to the carrying on of such a campaign. The place of the endowed Foundation we believe is to be very great in the future history of the United States.

Hospitals for the care of people in the country are

established in some county seats throughout the United States and hospital service is being extended in this field continually. These county hospitals are largely under individual and private promotion. They are sometimes granted a subsidy by the city or by the county. In Asheville, North Carolina, a private hospital receives more than half its funds from patients, one quarter from private subscriptions, and one quarter from the city; which pays its share over against the service rendered to patients for whom the city is responsible. On a basis of private contribution it is maintained by a devoted group of citizens of Asheville. In towns large and small in the Eastern States, where money is accumulating, similar hospitals are being erected. We know of instances as far west as Iowa. No complete record is available.

The War Service agencies, especially the Red Cross, have had a great opportunity in the past decade, which they have been prompt to use. The Red Cross has attempted since the war to establish home service in the care of returned and disabled soldiers and of their families. What the outcome of this will be does not yet appear, but the impetus given to public health by the American Red Cross out of the event of the war will doubtless be a lasting one. Whether in every county the Red Cross will establish a nursing service remains to be seen, but probably the impulse will be imparted to local groups of men and of women who will carry on, on their own initiative, the work which the Red Cross started previously for the rural soldier and his family. We believe it is better that the Red Cross remain in its character as an organization for crises than that it

should undertake to do the routine of universal health service.

Very reluctantly I believe that in the matter of universal rural health service we must depend on the state. It is not the best dependence. The service to be rendered by public officials in the use of money through taxation is generally poor service. The state can do well only those most necessary services without which human society could not exist. It is most efficient in detecting and punishing crime, administering justice, and prosecuting war, all of which are believed by men to be ultimate necessities of civilized life. So long as our standards do not demand a high condition of health it is doubtful whether the state can serve. Yet it is plain that no other agency can be depended on to provide the barest essentials. Disease is comparable to crime, against which the state alone can protect us. The enforcement of quarantine and of sanitation is already in the hands of cities and states. They are effectively administered in noted instances. Extending this service to the open country and to the village will probably produce good results if the extension is gradual and is preceded by private care and organization. Without private care and without public opinion to support it, the health service by the state will be a failure.

Let me add what seems at the present time to be the field in which the state can be effective. First: in the gathering of vital statistics, the facts as to births, deaths, marriages, contagious diseases, including venereal diseases, industrial accidents, ought now to be more systematically recorded. The attention of legislatures should be continually turned toward perfecting health records. Second: the state should provide, at first by

permissive laws, for school nurses, for county and for community nurses. This provision would make it possible for the communities financially able to meet their own needs, to set an example, to make the experiments and to determine the standards of service about which we know at present too little. Third: the state should continue those experiments in health extension, such as the health-mobile in New York City, the county or community clinic, provided for effectively in the law and in the administration of North Carolina, and the district health service made possible in Vermont. An excellent statement of these experiments is to be found in the address of President George E. Vincent before the National Country Life Association in Chicago, 1919, which is published in their Proceedings. Fourth: the unit of service which the state should provide, at least to which the state should contribute on a basis of a permissive law, is the local health center, which ought to be in each community; that is, in each residential area. A health center is a building under the care of a physician and at least one nurse. It should be an office, a clinic, an operating room, and a hospital in miniature. That is, there should be a place for consultation, a place for observation and studying of cases, a room furnished for emergency service in the case of operations, and at least three or five beds. How extensive this provision shall be in the two factors, operating room and beds, is a question of adequacy of other provision. If there is a hospital near at hand operative cases should be transferred there and hospital cases given care there. But the minimum of health service is in the office and clinic provision. There should at least be a nurse always on the job and a doctor within immediate call. With the

perfecting of country roads, with ease and promptness of communications between local farming area and the county seat, operative and hospital cases will be concentrated at the latter.

The fifth provision to which the state should contribute is the county hospital. It may not be at the county seat, and it might be provided for an area either larger or smaller than a county. These are questions which depend upon the local topography and the congested or dispersed condition of the population. This hospital should be near enough to every farmhouse for the transfer to it of operative cases, if possible of confinement cases, accident cases, and the patients who suffer from the major ailments. Here should be a modern unit of medical service with a sufficient number of physicians and nurses in attendance and an adequate equipment for the care of all cases except those few rare ones requiring treatment by the exceptional specialist.

For rural health service these two foci are necessary — the local health center and the county hospital. Other items will be added. Some have been already mentioned, such as the school nurse, the community nurse. Around these two revolves the whole system of rural care such as is adapted to modern husbandry. With less than these the provision is inadequate. Recognizing the permanence of the social forms of country life — isolated farms, diminished population, small villages — we believe that the rural population should have adequate provision for satisfactory health, happiness and efficiency. For this provision "socialized medicine" is necessary. Public subsidy and private endowment must pay the salaries of doctors and nurses who reside in the country, and the health centers and hospitals by

means of which they shall serve the town and country people.

In the meantime, and until the states are aroused to serve their part in rural health service, something must be done.

A program of rural sanitation will involve, first, the appeal to the strongest resident or outside factors in the population. Either there must be found among the people in the community those who will organize for the improvement of rural health or the movement must come from outside. The American Red Cross has a Town and Country Nursing Service which is a national agency organized for this purpose — to provide the outside leadership which is necessary in many places. If the people of the community cannot make the necessary beginnings an appeal should be made to the Red Cross for advice and perhaps for leadership.

In the local community the most helpful factor is an organization of women. A beginning can be better made by appealing to women in the interest of public health than to any other part of the population. The health of the home has been theirs to care for and they can understand the problems of the community which modern scientific knowledge is making plain. Women have found how to control the vermin which infest the house. In recent years it has become plain that the fly and the mosquito are social criminals. Before long we may hope that a fly in the house will be as repugnant to our cultivated sensibilities as a louse or a flea or the other filthy creatures at whose name we shudder. This transformation will be made by women. The house can be cleansed with a comb and brush and a broom; but the community can be made sanitary by a Woman's Club.

The first move to make in a community campaign, after discovering the center of organization in a Woman's Club or other society, is to make a health survey. Dr. J. N. Hurty, Secretary of the State Board of Health of Indiana, carried through a survey of ten counties in Indiana by means of a score-card on which he recorded the healthfulness or lack of it in the individual household. Each house was marked on ten points and for each point a credit of ten was possible. Thus a standard was attained by which the houses could be tested as centers of health or of disease. The report which resulted from this investigation showed a very low proportion of sanitary households in the first five counties surveyed. The following proportions were discovered: In the first 90.2 per cent of the farmhouses were insanitary; in the second 89 per cent insanitary; in the third 94.3 per cent insanitary; in the fourth 84 per cent insanitary; in the fifth 75.8 per cent insanitary. Such a survey will serve as a means of organizing popular opinion and of directing it toward the remedy. The survey should be made under the direction of the local leaders — the Woman's Club or other society suggested — and its findings should be published to them. Probably they should not be given general publicity. The attempt is to arouse active and practical interest, not to cause a sensation. Any survey of rural health which told the truth would cause a scandal if it were made generally public.

The third step in a rural health campaign is to secure the employment of a public health nurse. The profession of the physician and the profession of a nurse are turning attention upon public health. The practitioners in both have been so far indifferent to purely social duty. They have had to live upon fees paid them by the

individual for individual service and they could not. But now many young women are turning themselves from bedside nursing to the care of the health of the community. In them is to be found the beginning of such health service as country communities need.

The obligations of the public health nurse are confined to the people of the community, because she must always begin her work at the sick-bed. This generation will not welcome health propaganda without health work. The nurse, because she serves the public, must each day be ready to go to bedsides of those who are ill, change from street clothes to cap and apron, straighten the sheets, help the patient to get a bath and make him comfortable; consult as to the manner of taking medicine ordered by the family doctor, or even advise that the doctor be called. She must advise expectant mothers, and after the confinement visit the mother and baby for their help and guidance. She must be on hand with prompt, skilled hands to render first aid in time of accidents. She must be ready to call the doctor on the telephone and help him decide whether to come at once or not to come at all.

Always the doctor's helper, and sometimes employed as his professional aid, the public health nurse should reside so near the rural households that she can bring them the needful routine of bedside care, represent their needs to the physician, often at a distance, and to the hospital in the county seat. Her bedside service must not be so exacting in normal times as to preclude public service. Its purposes are two: the service of the sick, who have no other skilled help at command, and the commending of her public service to the minds of all men. If she eases the old farmer's sprain, the day he falls from

the barn loft, he will listen with respect to her address on " Soil Pollution " at the town fair. Preventive health work is new and alien to our habits of thought. Country people believe themselves to be fortunate in their rural health resources. It is hard to convince them that country life is not most healthful. Equally stubborn is the jungle of small ills in which they stumble, and the forest of diseases, accidents, contagious epidemics, confinements, for which adequate skilled guidance has never been available. A trained nurse in the community, within easy call of each household, will both ease their ills and convince their minds.

But there is better reason why the bedside is the place where the public health nurse should be found. She has the training and the people have the hurts. Farming is a precarious occupation. Those who follow it are all the time in danger of bodily accidents, infection and contagion incident to working with animals, and from diseases which thrive in the rural environment. Yet the medical profession shuns the country and crowds into the cities. The public health nurse, therefore, is needed in the country community as a sentinel of health. She is a shepherd guarding her flock on the lonely pastures.

After the care of the sick comes the problem of general education in health. The public health nurse should herself give, and should secure from others, lectures and talks on problems of health: the care of babies, the feeding of children, first aid for the injured, and the other problems of public health which have here been noted.

The work of a public health nurse and of the association which supports her will go into many channels, differing according to the local conditions; but as soon as the work is reasonably well established there should

be an attack upon those centers of contagion and upon those centers of prevalent ill-health which are discovered in that community. Higher standards must be described and made possible for the people of the community. If the medium of contagion from which the community suffers is the mosquito, the community program will differ from that in a community which suffers from the prevalence of hookworm disease. If the women of the community are burdened with too heavy physical labor under adverse conditions, the community program will be suitable to their relief; but whatever it be, the public health association will require the assistance of an employed worker and her program will engage all the forces of the community in abating the evils from which men suffer.

As in other social work, the health service of the community does not make people well. Its purpose is to put an end to causes of disease and death. Social service consists very largely in an attack upon the ills of life. It cannot directly effect the increase of good in life. But in the country the dominating motive in health service is to make the household permanent, to continue in the country neighborhood the lineage of the same name and the household group inheriting the qualities of ancestors known and revered. Rural sanitation has as its purpose the immortality of the family group.

X

GETTING A LIVING

The core of a community must be economic. The main business of life is to get a living. The reason for existence of any community is found in the living which it supplies its residents. Men are attracted to a community by the increases in their living furnished by that community. The first element in getting a living is securing daily bread, shelter, clothing, and the satisfaction of physical needs. It is a mistake to think of the community as beginning in religious institutions — narrowly understood — or in social gatherings or in educational service. The initial human experience is the finding of food.

But getting a living is a long process. A living is more than bread and a roof and a coat. In quest of a living men go from the country to the town and from the town to the city. They migrate from the small city to the large. In each of these moves they secure a further element in their living. Each of these communities is characterized by the increase which it contributes to the living of its citizens, but in every community the initial experience is the securing of daily bread, shelter, clothing, and material economic gains. Whatever is done, therefore, for the community, in a service to all the people, must have initial concern with the purely economic welfare of the people.

Sir Horace Plunkett's book, *The Rural Life Problem of the United States*, develops this principle very clearly. He shows that in the Country Life Movement in Ireland it was necessary to go into the very heart of the people's aspirations and organize their economic needs. It is necessary to understand the word "economic" if one would read these pages aright. Economic matters are not those of mere money. The word has a greater meaning than has the word finance. It connotes poverty as truly as wealth, and it is greater than both. The economic motive animates men in the quest of those vital satisfactions which the individual craves and the social group requires. Professor John Bates Clark has somewhere described this motive as the desire to preserve the present status, with a measure of improvement, for oneself and one's children after one; the desire to live on the same economic standard in one's own generation, and to be reasonably assured of the same security for one's children. This is not the desire to get rich, though in individual cases it is changed into a desire for wealth. It is a far more general, indeed a universal, aspiration, which inspires most of the work of the world. Industry is based on it. Civilization is propelled by it. It is the desire to get a living and the quest of an income.

I believe that this economic motive is religious. It is the quest for what a man has not but feels to be his. It engages his utmost efforts. It is labor for his wife and children and for all his group fellows, and therefore is involved in his holiest, most self-forgetting feelings. It takes him back to his parents and reminds him constantly of his ancestors. He forms his ideas of justice in his economic experiences. His ultimate conviction as

to the goodness or the badness of the world are the outgrowth of his experience in getting a living. Therefore his economic life is his wrestle with nature and with society. It generates in him all the religion he has.

I suppose it was in this sense that Jesus said, " I am come that they may have life, and that they may have it abundantly." Probably his meaning in the saying, " Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God," was that the quest of a living is a satisfaction of successive economic wants of which bread is but the first. Every truth that we know involves men in an economic want. Education is one of the most general wants. It comes in the series somewhat later than bread. The love of music is an economic want, which comes generally later than education. But both are a part of a living.

Economic wants among common folk are usually the source of religious feeling. Few desire to be rich; a lesser number strive to get wealth; and very few attain a fortune. Most of men seek and get a living. The best of men, and the most religious, are those whose economic experience brings them a series of satisfactions, beginning with bread, clothing, shelter, education in the essentials, music, and a little esthetic culture, gradually extending into higher forms of human enjoyment. The simplest religious craving is for economic assurance of supply. " The Lord is my shepherd: I shall not want " is on the most thumbed page of the Bible. The play of these economic aspirations among poor people results in all the simpler and most general religious feelings. With the rise of the aspirations of the individual, and the ideals of the group, toward higher

satisfactions, the religious experiences should become nobler, more refined.

None of these wants is itself sinful, for all of them make up life. They are the steps on the way from bread to God. The business of the teacher and preacher of religion is to know the wants of his people; to study those which are satisfied in his community; and so to build the community that for most of its people and for the most desirable people, all the vital necessities of life shall be satisfied in the community in which the desire for bread is satisfied. The problem of amusement exhibits these principles clearly. Farming is austere, and few farming communities have recreation adequate to the demand of the young people and the working people who live on the farms. Agriculture is becoming more systematic and more exacting in its demands; and systematic work creates a demand for organized play. As this demand is not satisfied in the country — indeed it is less generally satisfied now than in former times — the youth and working man from farming communities go to the towns and larger villages for amusement. These centers of population have a disproportionate share, therefore, of cheap vaudeville shows, dance halls, professional baseball games, and moving pictures.

Common-school education is a function which country communities have surrendered to the centers of population. The one-room country school has long been inadequate; but the farmer has not improved it, preferring to rely upon the town schools to which he will remove his family after he has made enough money on the farm.

Unfortunately, churches in the country are too often recruiting stations for the cities and colleges. The

ministers are respectable pullers-in for the city show. Nothing rejoices them so much as to help their young men and women find a position in the city; unless it be to have a bright lad or girl go off to college. When a country minister was reminded that all these departures weakened the country community, and that very few of them benefitted the lad or girl who went to the city, he replied, " You cannot blame them; there is nothing here to keep them."

The " rural exodus " has had its Moses in the rural college student, its Aaron in the country minister, and its Miriam in the country school-teacher. These three have led a generation out of the country to perish in the wilderness. For only a pitiful few of those who leave the country come to prominence in the city. Most of them gain but a poor living there, and very many go to ruin. The church should be the savior of the community, as her Master is of the soul.

According to the law of diminishing returns, the first satisfactions of any want have infinite value. What does this mean but that they have religious value? The first drink of water to a famished man calls forth a fervent, " Thank God." The first book printed is a Bible. The first landing on American soil was a solemn religious occasion — and still is for the immigrant. So the first increase of pay is of religious value to the poor. The first hundred dollars to a mechanic's family is invested in a dozen benefits. The first thousand dollars which a working farmer saves go into a home, a piano, or books, or an education for a child. It is all moral and spiritual good. Later thousands have diminishing moral and spiritual values. Most of the churches and homes in America were paid for out of

the tithes of men and women who owned at the time a margin of less than a thousand dollars in savings.

This is the reason for the religious character of economic life. Most people spend their lives with less than a thousand dollars. They are poor and money does them good, not harm. They need to know how to use it. But getting a living is a process prolific in religious feeling, because economic matters have to them the infinite value of first satisfactions of all the simplest wants of life.

The salvation of the community will be accomplished in satisfying the higher wants of those whose lower wants are satisfied. For those who "have made money," supply schools; for those who work, supply recreation; for the sick, establish hospitals; for the invalid, build sanitariums; and for all men, supply social life, the greatest need of human life on the level of earth. For those who are thus united to the community and to one another in the intricate network of associations, the opportunity of worship together and of sharing common spiritual interests becomes the highest economic want.

The modern farmer has to "do business." He has no choice. Whatever be the mysterious reasons in view of which he gave up the life of barter and uses goods that other men have produced, they are irresistible reasons to him. Bertrand Russell says the reason is that the world will not leave him alone. It is not a matter of persuasion that the farmer becomes consumer; it is a response to necessity. When farmers are consumers of other men's goods they become business men.

The people in villages and open country want better health. It is an aspiration distinctly new. The con-

trast between a modern farmer and an old-fashioned laborer employed by him exhibits this newness of the health standard. The modern family has a bathroom and uses it. The old-fashioned laborer takes no bath for six months at a time. The wife of the farmer objects to feeding unclean men in her kitchen. She entertains feelings toward her help which would astonish them if she were to express what she thinks. The difference of standards at this point increases the difficulty of carrying on the modern farm; for farm labor is generally recruited from people of the older point of view who care little about the standards of cleanliness and health required in our time.

The cost of health service is a fixed charge upon modern farming; by the older custom health service was traditional and cost little or nothing. Now the demands of people who have lived in cities can be satisfied only with the employment of professional health workers whose salaries and expenses must be paid.

Ever since 1909, when the Roosevelt Country Life Commission Report set a new standard of country living, the question of the cost of "better living" has been in the minds of social workers. Every proposed advance for a time met the answer of the farmer, "We cannot afford it."

Under the leadership of Dean Liberty Hyde Bailey of Cornell, who was chairman of that Commission, studies were made in 1908 and years following for the purpose of measuring the farmer's ability to pay for the improvement of his community. Prof. G. F. Warren and Prof. K. C. Livermore published in March, 1911, the *Bulletin* No. 295, which has been a mile-post in the thinking of men on rural improvement. It is entitled, *An Agricul-*

tural Survey of Townships of Tompkins County, New York. This pamphlet was the result of five years of painful experimenting and investigation. The story is fascinating. It opens a new field of thought. The result is simple, but the process was a baffling and tedious one. The product of the survey was the labor income method and the measurement of labor income. It was found that in certain counties of New York, selected as representative counties, the average labor income was $423. Estimating at that time that the laborer employed by the farmer received an income of $350 for his work, it is plain the pay for management in addition to toil was little more than the pay for toil alone. Neither the farmer nor his laborer received much more than a dollar a day for his work.

The method of arriving at this measurement of the farmer's pay was this: an inventory is made once a year of all the farmer's productive capital and a financial estimate is made of its value at that time. Then the farmer's receipts are ascertained, including the pay he has received for labor done, teams hired out, and also including the increase in inventory over the preceding year. Then his expenses are recorded, including taxes and decrease in inventory over the preceding year. The difference between the two is farm income. This is what the farmer has on which to live, to feed, clothe, and educate his family in so far as these things are not supplied by the farm in the form of fuel, vegetables, milk, and free rent. These also the farm laborer usually receives. Out of farm income the farmer must pay interest on borrowed money. Now the farmer is both a laborer and an investor. In order to ascertain what pay he gets for his labor Professors Warren and Liver-

more subtract from his labor income the interest on his capital estimated at five per cent. There is left his pay as a laborer, called " labor income." Disregarding minor items, this is the amount the farmer has that is his own as a worker. Experience has shown that here is a measure of the ability of the farmer to contribute to social expenditures. This is the amount of money he has on which the community can call. Out of it he will willingly pay what he can to those causes which help him and his family. This is his measure of his ability to contribute to public interests.

The labor income of the farmer thus ascertained is disappointingly small. So long as the price of land increases with every increase of farming prosperity the labor income will continue to be small, because the interest on invested capital will increase with the increase of prosperity. As prices of farm products rise the farmer may wisely mortgage his land; so that he must pay an increased interest on borrowed money. His income as an investor is thus diminished. With higher prices he must depend, as with lower prices he depends, on his labor income. In the early period of the Great War the price of land did not rise as rapidly as the price of farm products, so that for the first years of the war period the farmer in the Middle West had a considerably increased income; but soon farm speculation hoisted the price of farm land. At the same time the price of all the goods which the farmer had to buy increased and by 1919–20 the farmer was caught with a reduced labor income and an increased expenditure.

The labor income of 2,090 farmers in 1913 was reported upon in the " Annals " by Mr. E. H. Thompson as follows:

State	*Farm Income*	*Labor Income*
Oregon	1,007	261
Iowa	1,450	290
Indiana	1,187	310
New Hampshire	604	337
New York	699	423
Michigan	1,069	481
Illinois	3,177	622
Pennsylvania	1,314	790
Average	1,313	439

A careful study of farmers' incomes since the war shows an increase up to the year 1918, but this increase is not as great as the increased cost of living. In Lenoway County, Michigan, a bulletin reports labor incomes of farmers $481, of cash tenants $651, and of share tenants $564. After that date the rising price of land automatically reduced the labor income of the farmer, which subjected him also to increased fixed charges that absorbed a greater part of his farm income. By 1920 the farmer found no market for his products, so that, with heavier costs of the goods for which he had to pay money, many a farmer in the Middle West was ruined. A considerable number of tenants were forced into bankruptcy.

The agricultural colleges of the various states have been studying the problem of the income of the farmer after the pattern of the Cornell studies. The labor income has been universally accepted as a measure of the public concern in farming. The method of ascertaining it has been used in the Fourteenth Census and in the income tax calculation. There are defects in this

method of calculating the income of the farmer, but not such as to discredit it as a method. Assuming that refinements will add to the efficiency of this method of measurement of agricultural profit, it may be accepted as the best available test of the adequacy of farming to support a social program.

The purpose of this book is to describe the unfolding social life of the country, to show the growth of wants and aspirations, and to describe the emotions necessary for their satisfaction. I am trying to put before both myself and my reader the present and future life of people in the small communities, who produce a bulk of the food and raw materials of life. Let us turn, therefore, to another inquiry. What will be the cost of the program of rural organization to which country people are now turning? What will be the necessary expenditure in a rural community which is provided with an adequate school system; with at least one church, and probably two churches, having each a resident pastor; with medical service involving a resident nurse, probably a physician residing in the community or in the next community; with a county health office suitable to the directing of public health work; with a community house adequately supervised and directed by a resident secretary or agent; and with county service in the field of agricultural development? This inquiry does not include many of the most necessary features of country life, such as a local library, museum for art appreciation and theater for dramatic expression and musical enjoyment. The inquiry is, whether the program here discussed, which is only a moderate expression of the demands made on behalf of the rural population by its more intelligent men and by extension work-

ers, can be paid for out of the income derived from the farm; for there is no money in the village that does not come from the farm. Generally the small towns and villages do not have manufacturing industries. Land is the basis of at least local taxation. Therefore, it is a fair question whether the farmer can pay the bills of the evolution of his community from the self-sufficing household farmer to an independent, self-respecting community, in which men and women are satisfied to live.

The expenditures to be met are in two classes: first, community expenditures; second, county expenditures. Can the farmer pay his due share of both of these or must the farming occupation be recognized as a deficit business which must be maintained by subsidies from the state because of its fundamental importance? Until farming is an independent business, possessing enough money to pay its bills, we cannot expect the highest grade men and women to work in it.

In the local communities in the United States there are from fifty to five hundred families. The modern community should have at least five teachers, including a principal of a consolidated school; a pastor and an assistant, or two pastors, at least; a resident physician or at least a nurse, and a community secretary. These persons should all be professionally trained. They should give their whole time to their work.

A rural county should have in addition to the ordinary state officials, such as the sheriff, the county judge, the clerk of court, the county clerk, the jailer, and the constable, also the following agents, employed to carry out the program of modern community development: three agricultural agents, a county agent, a home demonstration agent, a boys' and girls' club agent; a county health

officer with adequate assistants; a county superintendent of schools with at least two supervisors under his direction; a county Y. M. C. A. or Y. W. C. A. secretary who shall be the agent of the churches in their work and their representative in doing work in their fields for which they are not organized.

The labor income available in the average inhabited county of the United States will show a variation of from $200 to $600, so that with fifty to five hundred families in the community the local income will vary between $10,000 and $300,000. Remembering that this income must pay the cost of family life except certain items received from the farm, it is impossible to expect that more than one-tenth of it may be taken for the social program of the community. That is, the average community may have available for its local program from $1,000 to $30,000. In addition to the local program, the county agents named must be provided for, since their supervision makes the local program effective. In the typical county in the United States there are from 1,000 to 10,000 families. We may suppose therefore that the agricultural county has a labor income of $100,000 to $6,000,000. One-tenth of this amount is $10,000 to $600,000, which may be estimated as the available social income of the county.

Now the expenditures should be considered first of all for the community. It is impossible to write down for the United States as a whole any precise amount that would cover the salaries of workers whose financial rewards vary widely but the estimated salaries and expenses of the community workers required for this program is $35,000. This is more than the maximum income estimated for the most prosperous community

in which the labor income is the highest and the number of families highest. That is, the estimated cost of the local community program in the average instance is more than 10 per cent of the average income in the most favorable community. But we must add the cost of the county workers. Again recognizing the variation in the salaries paid and the many items impossible to estimate it is believed probable that the county program of community organization will cost $25,000. Since there are in these average counties in the most settled sections of the country about twenty communities this county expenditure for social improvement adds about $1,200 to each community, making the total charge to be assessed against each community for a program of social improvement $36,200. Against the county the charge of this social program is $724,000; to be paid for by a tithe of its highest labor income, $600,000.

These estimates are the merest approximates. They are no more than a hint of the reckoning that could be made in each community and county as to the adequacy of the local income. It is not too much to say, however, that they indicate the reason for the social poverty in the country. The farmer cannot pay for what he wants. The statement he has for many decades made that he cannot afford these proposed improvements is true. His own practical sense ascertains what the economist has later by inductive study confirmed and recorded. The appalling fact is that farming, the most important and fundamental of all occupations, is a deficit business. It cannot pay its way except it be a way of privation, of sacrifice, and of humiliation which the modern young man and woman will not endure. Here is found a reason why so many men and women are leaving the country.

The root cause is not itself financial; it is the desire to live well, to have the social satisfactions which modern invention and intelligence have provided and modern art and industry have put upon the market at moderate prices. The farmer who leaves his farm to go to live in town does not want to make money so far as this action is concerned. He frequently goes into town to live at a starvation rate in a pinched and narrow village. But he is seeking and he gets in the village medical service, cheap recreation, better schools, and a church that has a resident minister. These are very conservative wants, and in the country he could not satisfy them. Even in the agricultural village his satisfactions are so scanty and poor that these villages are the vestibule of the bigger towns and the cities to which farmers and their sons move on for higher wages and better opportunities to live.

This situation demands a remedy. The intelligent American cannot contentedly see so large and important a section of the population disappointed and humiliated as farmers are. The remedy must be partly legislative and mainly, we believe, through organization of cooperative business by which the farmer may keep a larger share of the wealth he produces for himself.

Meantime it is well and necessary that the business of farming be subsidized, at least for the time being, through state action. The state laws should strengthen the school system and support it in part out of moneys gathered throughout the whole state, because under our present system the profits of farm production are hoarded in the big towns and cities by manufacturers, bankers, and middlemen. Churches must, through their national boards and their state boards, assemble funds which

shall be, for the time being, spent upon these rural communities which have no resident pastor, for some which have not even a preacher. Recreation will have to be provided by agencies like the Y. M. C. A. and Community Service, Inc., which assemble the gifts of wealthy men to spend these funds upon expert supervision of local rural communities. Such organizations render community service as carried over from the World War. They are a timely and statesmanlike type of paternalism in the service they render to the small community. The American Red Cross has done good work in meeting the present deficit in the country and providing public health nurses for those who could not provide for themselves.

But we insist that the fundamental question discussed in this chapter is the question of getting a living. An American wants to get a living for himself. The industry of farming is attractive to men because it has the appearance of independence. If its real independence passes away, and farming becomes a deficit occupation in years to come as it appears to be in the present decade, then good strong men will not enter it, and we will have a breakdown of our whole agricultural structure. No greater change in the moral and spiritual character of the United States could be threatened than this change. If this is what is before us, we had better prepare for it. The only way to avoid it is the way of increasing farm prosperity by practical measures, by protecting the farmer against exploitation, educating him for his vocation, and inspiring him to maintain himself as an independent productive American respecting himself, sustaining his family and paying his own bills.

XI

COOPERATION

The business of country people is done in the village and in the city as well as in the open country. Farmers forget that the day of barter has passed. Aversion to the city and suspicion of its business cannot hide the fact that the city's business is the farmer's business. What he sells goes through the central marts of trade; what he buys comes by ships that cross the sea and by railways which penetrate to the centers of the great market cities. The farmer can never do his business by withdrawing from the city and acting as an alien to it or by thinking of the city as alien to him. He must needs trace his goods to the very floor of the exchange and acquaint himself with the sources of what he buys in the factory. The forge and the loom are tools of production just as much as the corn planter or the potato digger.

The farmer is not the only producer. The farmer must follow his business to its true centers. He will find these centers in the big cities. The present organization of farmers' business is largely uncooperative, though a change is coming.

Recent books have very clearly described the process of farm business. Wells' *Marketing of Farm Products* measures the values imparted to the goods by those who receive them from the farmer's hands and improve them for the consumer's use. *Cooperation in Agriculture* by Powell is a description of the combinations of farmers which do business for their members in various products.

These books show that the farmer brings his products as a rule to a place of primary distribution and turns them over to a local buyer. There may be in a country neighborhood several such buyers, each handling his product. All too often there is but one who performs the necessary service of finding a buyer for the farmer's goods. He sometimes makes an undue profit. The goods are then shipped to the city and pass through the hands of wholesale receivers, with the intervention sometimes of commission men, brokers, and, in cases of many products, the storage warehouse. In the case of some products the auction house is the center of distribution. In some staples, as milk, the distribution is by great companies with organized facilities. Speculation plays a legitimate part in regulating the flow of products within the market and in uniforming the price against the inequalities of the season and of the region. The storage of farm products, moreover, tends to equalize, over against the seasonable abundance or scarcity, both the price which the farmer receives and that which the consumer has to pay.

The part played by the jobber, who purchases from the wholesaler or other middleman a portion of the product suited to the taste of his particular customers, is a real part, since preferences of masses of consumers are a large factor in the market. He creates a value and adds to what the farmer created, by offering it where it is most wanted.

Finally, the goods, when delivered in small quantities to the city retailer or to the country merchant, — for farmers also are consumers, — must bring a large profit to the ultimate retailer who receives almost as large a share, sometimes a larger, of the consumer's price as the

farmer receives. The largest fraction of the "spread" between the producer's price and the consumer's price is kept by the retailer, usually a small merchant. The retailer has to have on his shelves suitable quantities of many kinds of goods. He is obliged to give credit to many customers, but has, as a rule, small capital. Advances must be made to the retailer by the wholesaler or the jobber, who are in their way capitalists. Many retailers every year fail in business. If economies could be effected in the work of the retailer, they would help both producer and consumer to retain a better share. But the same may be said of the farmer, in whose work great economies should be effected. As the process now stands, however, the largest rewards are retained by the farmer at one end of the line and the retailer at the other. The series of those who each give a plus value to the goods in the long path from producer to consumer, — even if it does not include a manufacturer, — is a long one.

The farmer's business in life is satisfying wants of mankind. What he produces is not bad but good. Its use is to appease the hunger and the thirst, the cold and the discomfort of life. But the problem of farm business consists in a study of the character of the wants of the consuming people. This is well illustrated in the liking of Boston for brown eggs and New York for white. The taste in either case is arbitrary, but all market-men know that it is definite and it cannot be opposed; it can only be satisfied.

Probably a chief factor, therefore, in the improvement of farm business will be the knowledge of the wants of the people. Farmers need to be world men. The old conception of the farmer based on barter and family

industry, that is, " what is good enough for him ought to be good enough for anybody," will have to pass. If the farmer is to feed the whole people he must understand the wants of the market and know how to appeal to them. He must have what men want if he expects to profit by dealing with other men.

This necessity of knowledge of the market is the basis of some of the best cooperative farm businesses. The raising of cattle for the market is an experience in which farmers have learned not to compete but to act collectively. Throughout the country in the recent generation such associations as the Holstein-Frisian Association have arisen, which recognizes that, if all the farmers of a region raise a certain breed of cattle, they will attract buyers in greater number than if each farmer produces ever so perfectly a separate breed of cattle. Thus whole counties have devoted themselves each to one breed of cow. Certain states have become famous for raising race-horses. Cooperative action appears to be the best means of responding to the needs of the market. Wants are social and express themselves in identical terms to wide areas. The satisfaction of these wants can be socialized and can express itself in adequate organization.

For fifty years the American farmer has been studying cooperation. Many experiments, since those early times of the granges in the seventies, have been made in every form, from a partnership and a small joint cooperative organization to the powerful network of societies known as the California Fruit Growers Exchange, which markets in a year half a hundred million dollars worth of fruit. The country over men have tried to do the business of farming collectively. Every neighbor-

hood knows its failure. Older men are usually discouraged and pessimistic as to the possible success of cooperative action. Yet, by this long story of trial and error, the true method is being found and organized. Probably the progress of cooperative organization in the country is as rapid as can be hoped or expected, considering the isolation of the American farmer, whose facilities for collective discussion are all too few; and the vastness of the country.

A business program for a community in the country would involve the study of the local community as a business center. It might well be made by a group of business men or by a high-school class acting under a leader. The beginning of this study would be a map of the business of the community, the avenues of trade tinted to show the proportion of business which each carries, and the centers of trade designated by symbols corresponding to the different products.

The second step would be the study of the city to which the products go and the measurement of the services rendered by each of those who have handled the farmer's goods, with comparison of the reward each receives according to record. Books and public reports are now abundant to show the service rendered by the various middlemen who "save time for the producer and the consumer." People resident in the country should know the whole market. They should be aware of what becomes of their goods and they should be able to trace them through the big city. The country boy ought to learn to be at home in the big city, for it belongs to him. If he is to do business, he must know that the city is the center of business life.

Likewise the products which the farmer buys should

be studied, especially in the schools. If there be a wedding in the community, it would be interesting for the girls to study the costume of the bride and to become acquainted with the countries from which come all the things entering into her wardrobe. The boys might find equal interest in studying their own costume, simple as it is, for the whole world is at work producing the materials and improving the products that enter into a change of raiment worn by even a farm-hand in the country.

The important factor in business, therefore, is its world-wide character. The market into which the farmer has come is one. He must needs learn in his church a gospel that is for every creature, in his school a geography that is world-wide and a history which will inform him as to the meaning of the business he inherits from his father, the oldest industry in the world.

In contrast to other classes of population, country people have a marked preference for individual action and an aversion to cooperative work. The cause is historical and the condition is not wholly subject to persuasion. The American farmer has not cooperated in the past because, by the necessities of his life, he was independent. In order to secure a living he had to go apart from his fellows. He was dependent only upon wife and child, kinsman and hireling. Pioneer life still remains a power with us. So long as agriculture is solitary work and its processes take a man away from his fellows, cooperation will be difficult. He thinks his way of life is the right way because it is necessary for him. So long as the American farmer has to practise a variety of trades, he will be of unstable emotion, and the social life of the country will be broken up by feuds, divisions, active suspicions, separations, and continued misunder-

standings. No mere education as to alleged right and wrong can plaster over the old economy with new ethical standards. Until the loneliness and emotion are taken out of the farming country, people will cooperate with reluctance.

A good part of the United States is still in the household farmer way of life. The small group is the unit, too small for effective business, too poor to invest much, too local to reach a wide mark. The household group is satisfactory in just such degree as will convince a man that he need not cooperate. The historical process, by which this group life is broken down, its family pride humbled, its futility made known, is exploitation. Farmers whose lands have not been exploited and whose group life has not suffered the undermining influence of speculation in land will not normally cooperate. The loyalty of the American farmer to his group is the emotional reason for refusal to cooperate or revolt against his cooperative promises. He is, in this, obeying an economic condition which has shaped his life, satisfied his desires, and controls his action.

The migrant habits of American country people pull them away from cooperation. The man who is looking for a cheap farm to buy cares more for the road and the market prices than for a union with his neighbors. He can endure low prices in the hope of making a strike. The farmer given to speculation will, of course, not cooperate except with reservations; because his mind is on the rising price of land, not upon the low price of wheat. This migrant tendency is inherited from both the pioneering and the exploiting periods. The one steps on the heels of the other. The sons of pioneers and the sons of speculators are both too excited and too unstable to

support loyally a breeders' association or a produce exchange.

Another great reason that has kept American farmers out of the cooperative experience is in the nature of the village. It is too generally a traders' center. The bank, the stores, and the agencies are all located conveniently near to the farmers for the purpose of making money, and in those villages which lack leadership large enough to comprehend the whole countryside this exploitation of the farmers is a shameful, ruthless process. It is generally quite unconscious. Those who carry it on would be surprised to think they were compared — as they are in the mind of the silent, indignant farmer — to bloodsuckers or parasites, but so he too often thinks of them. Studies of villages and towns show a sinister contrast between the "economic basin" of which the village is the center and the "social basin" of which the village is the center. The radius of trade around the town is twice as long, the radius of banking is four times as long, as the radius of voluntary social meeting. The farmer has an aversion to the village. He prefers no social life, or a thin substitute for it, to associating in a friendly way with the people of the village, who live upon him.

The village people, because they are interested in banking, are unfriendly to cooperative rural credit. Because they have a condensery in the village they are unfriendly or indifferent to the cooperative creamery. They have a kinder feeling toward the privately owned elevator than toward the farmers' elevator. They resent the tendency of the dwellers on the land to combine for their own business. Every such combination appears like a slight and an affront to the village people.

It is not unfair, therefore, to say that the customary organization of the American village is an obstacle in the way of cooperative organization of farmers.

Another obstacle is the idea of level democratic equality which prevails in the country. In a simple society where the farm-hand sits at the table and the head of the house may have been a farm-hand himself who married his employer's daughter, it is natural that this ideal of equality should be thought universal. Those who have known land-ownership as a universal experience and who see it as a general experience about them today naturally think of themselves as the equals of any and every man equal to every other. So long as this ideal prevails the subjection of one to another and the control of a man's private interest by the interest of the community are almost impossible. Farmers cannot cooperate when they think of social life in the terms of pure democracy. There is needed an experience of team work, a loyal and distinct obedience to leaders, before they can cooperate. These things come, not by persuasion, but by experience. Cooperation is the act of a mature people. Not until country people have passed through the earlier stages and discarded earlier ideals can the organization inculcate the spirit and the thought of cooperation.

The experience of the world, according to many observers, is that people cooperate only when they feel the necessity. This is not to say that necessity itself results in cooperation but that the sense of it is indispensable. When men become aware that they must, then alone will they act together in the orderly, precise ways and within the regulated channels of agricultural cooperation. This awareness of necessity comes with a

high standard of living. Mere poverty will not do it nor hunger, but wants, desires, aspirations and imitation of people who live well. Therefore, the cities and towns, which oppose the farmer so bitterly in his cooperative attempts, arouse in him the spirit of aspiration without which he would not act together with his fellow farmers. By their habits of expenditure, their enjoyments of the inventions and the arts, he is awakened to demand what they have for himself.

I wonder if I may add that international examples have had an influence in America. These at least contributed to our knowledge the formula and the method of cooperation. Americans are looking with growing interest upon the experience of Denmark where a multitude of cooperative associations represent the spirit of the people. This spirit has been developed and cultivated in that country for more than fifty years. Observers all testify that the prosperity of Denmark is a result of the work of these cooperatives. The exodus from the country has been arrested. Agriculture has been made a desirable occupation, profitable for the farmer, and conservative for the state. The people as a whole have taken front rank in social and economic welfare. At the heart of this constructive growth of Denmark is cooperation. In Sir Horace Plunkett's book, *The Rural Life Problem in the United States*, he develops this principle clearly. In the book, *Rural Reconstruction in Ireland*, by Smith-Gordon and Staples, the story is told of his work of faith for Ireland in the past thirty-three years. Sir Horace testifies that, in the organization of country life in Ireland, it was necessary to go into the very heart of the people's experience to organize their economic and social processes by cooperative forms:

" When farmers combine, it is a combination not of money only, but of personal effort in relation to the entire business. In a cooperative creamery, for example, the chief contribution of a shareholder is in milk; in a cooperative elevator, corn; in other cases it may be fruit or vegetables or a variety of material things rather than cash. But it is, most of all, a combination of neighbors within an area small enough to allow of all the members meeting frequently at the business center. As the system develops, the local associations are federated for larger business transactions, but these are governed by delegates carefully chosen by the members of the constituent bodies. The object of such associations is not primarily to declare a dividend, but rather to improve the conditions of the industry for the members.

" It is recognized that the poor man's cooperation is as important as the rich man's subscription. ' One man, one vote ' is the almost universal principle in cooperative bodies.

" The distinction between the capitalistic basis of joint stock organization and the more human character of the cooperative system is fundamentally important.

" In this matter I am here speaking from practical experience in Ireland. Twenty years ago the pioneers of our rural life movement found it necessary to concentrate their efforts upon the reorganization of the farmer's business.

" 1. We began with the dairying industry, and already half the export of Irish butter comes from the cooperative societies we established.

" 2. Organized bodies of farmers are learning to pur-

chase their agricultural requirements intelligently and economically.

"3. They are also beginning to adopt the methods of the organized foreign farmer in controlling the sale of their butter, eggs and poultry in the British markets.

"4. And they not only combine in agricultural production and distribution, but are also making a promising beginning in grappling with the problem of agricultural finance. It is in the last portion of the Irish program that by far the most interesting study of the cooperative system can be made, on account of its success in the poorest parts of the Island. Furthermore, the attempt to enable the most embarrassed section of the Irish peasantry to procure working capital illustrates some features of agricultural cooperation which will have suggestive value for American farmers.

"A body of very poor persons, individually — in the commercial sense of the term — insolvent, manage to create a new basis of security which has been somewhat grandiloquently and yet truthfully called 'the capitalization of their honesty in industry.' The way in which this is done is remarkably ingenious. The credit society is organized in the usual democratic way explained above, but its constitution is peculiar in one respect. The members have to become jointly and severally responsible for the debts of the association, which borrows on this unlimited liability from the ordinary commercial bank, or in some cases, from government sources. After the initial stage, when the institution becomes firmly established, it attracts local deposits, and thus the savings of the community, which are too often hoarded, are set free to fructify in the community. The procedure by which the money borrowed is lent to

the members of the association is the essential feature of the scheme. The member requiring the loan must state what he is going to do with the money. He must satisfy the committee of the association, who know the man and his business, that the proposed investment is one which will enable him to repay both principal and interest. He must enter into a bond with two sureties for the repayment of the loan, and his sureties are very carefully considered. The period for which the loan is granted is arranged to meet the needs of the case, as determined by the committee after a full discussion with the borrower. Once the loan has been made, it becomes the concern of every member of the association to see that it is applied to the ' approved purpose ' — as it is technically called. What is more important is that all the borrower's fellow-members become interested in his business and anxious for its success.

" The fact that nearly three hundred of these societies are at work in Ireland and that, although their transactions are on a very modest scale, the system is steadily growing both in the numbers of its adherents and in the turnover, — this fact is, I think, a remarkable testimony to the value of the cooperative system. The details I have given illustrate one important distinction between cooperation, which enables the farmer to do his business in a way that suits him, and the urban form of combination which is unsuited to his needs."

These international influences toward cooperation are becoming every year more effective. The American is recognizing the identity of his experience with that of the west European peoples who invented the method of cooperation. We have seen that our own experiments have no profit in their difference from one another.

We have discovered that there is no success in eccentricity, but that the cooperative formulæ are precise. They cannot be successfully counterfeited, or safely alloyed with joint stock forms of control. There is one way of cooperation and no other. Any alloy is costly. Every pretense costs money and loses time; so that the experience of western Europe has gradually prevailed throughout the United States. Our own experience too has been assembled with it, the whole constituting a technique of cooperation which, by selection and elimination, is the perfected product of the past eighty years.

Many experiments were made in this country after the organization of the Patrons of Husbandry in 1867. During the twenty years that followed that date, a wild enthusiasm for collective action swept over the Middle West and extended throughout the agricultural states. Very much of that early crop of cooperatives was failure. But everywhere the experience was remembered among farmers with hope as well as annoyance and humiliation. The Society of Equity in the Northwest, the Farmers' Union in the South, the growers of Burley tobacco in Kentucky, citrus fruit growers on the Coast, grain growing farmers in the Middle West, and truck farmers in the Eastern States persisted in cooperative attempts. Their persistence has been awarded with a measure of success. Since 1890 the growth of solid and permanent cooperation has been steady. Since 1910 it has been the goal of a national agitation in which intelligent leadership, criticism, and international exchange of experience have made their contributions. The World War seemed to put an end to the old time of doubt. Now it is only a question of minor, though all-important, adjustments.

Cooperation is no longer in doubt. It is an article of the national faith.

For the forms of cooperative organizations, the number of locals, the amounts expended, the business done, and the laws which are beginning to be passed regulating the prices of agricultural cooperation, the reader is referred to volumes by Powell, *Cooperation in Agriculture;* by Harris, *Cooperation: the Hope of the Consumer;* and by Herrick, *Rural Credits.* I am interested here in the place cooperation has in a developed community. The formative influence of local cooperatives in registering a new spirit and in redirecting the modes of thought and feeling of the countryside is the very center of adult education.

The traditional economy which centered in the household form was independent. Farmers still idolized an individual, or rather a group, success. But the farmer is forced to see that the prices of his products in the market are fixed by marginal goods. For instance, the market milk for which the price is paid to dairy farmers is the milk that can barely secure a market by meeting the tests. The farmer who produces a better grade than the test milk gets nothing for the difference. Cooperation is the measure by which the producers of marginal goods can be influenced. To raise the standard of his product so that a higher price can be secured for the total product requires a combination of producers. The only way for the better farmer to secure a better gain is to engage in cooperation, which includes the poor and the marginal farmers. The difficulty in the past was in finding the method by which farmers should organize so as to be permanently satisfied.

Cooperatives have acquired, in all countries of the

world, a form of organization that assembles their separated units into a mass of business great enough to command attention in the market. The following conditions therefore of cooperative organization have been wrought out on the anvil of experience:

1. The local organization must be the unit. Not a national federation or a state-wide control, but local autonomy, a self-government in the community unit, is characteristic of agricultural cooperation in America and in Europe. A sentence in the preface of *Cooperation in Danish Agriculture* by Harold Faber is: "The local societies form the backbone of the Danish cooperative movement. Local societies of the same county sometimes combine to form associations but the independence of the local societies remains unimpaired." This is the principle of community independence. The reason why it is satisfactory to the independent individual farmer is that the local unit is made of men he personally knows. The limit of acquaintance is the limit of organization. Beyond the radius of personal and neighborly acquaintance the creamery or the grain elevator does not extend its membership. Federations of these local units are necessary, but the local unit is the place of control and of profit.

2. Another characteristic of cooperation is that each local unit performs one process. The work of the local unit must be readily understood if it is to succeed. There must not be many things done in the meeting, but only those which an unlearned man not accustomed to the intricacies of business can understand. The member of a cooperative must feel that he votes intelligently. If he loses this confidence, he will cease to attend and withdraw his trade. If he continues to trust it, he will never break his cooperative agreement.

3. The third characteristic of the cooperative, usually mentioned first, is that each member has one vote. To put it otherwise, a cooperative is a union of men, not of capital. Sometimes a member has a vote for each acre, sometimes he has a vote for each ten cows in his dairy, but always the cooperative is governed by working farmers, not by the capital loaned. The membership is by patrons only. The method of voting and control, commonly called "the one-man-one-vote method," is the characteristic thing of all cooperatives, even though in some it is disguised.

4. The fourth characteristic of cooperatives which makes them community builders is that the interest on capital borrowed is fixed and the ownership of capital limited. Profits are not paid in the form of increased dividends but, after interest is paid on borrowed capital, after other fixed charges and expenses of maintenance are paid, the profits are distributed in a patronage dividend, that is, each participating member receives a share of profit proportional to his participation in the business of the cooperative.

5. The fifth characteristic of cooperation in which again the new community spirit expresses itself is that collective obligation is undertaken by each cooperator for the whole. In its highest form this is the unlimited liability of the Raiffeisen Cooperative Credit Association. But in many lower forms it appears. Sometimes it is merely a contract to sell all of a given product through the cooperative. Always it lays upon each member an obligation to the whole. It deprives him in a measure of his freedom of action.

6. There is a cooperative spirit born of these experiences. Such a spirit is necessary to the continuance of

these societies. They cannot go on without it. Some of the cooperatives cultivate this feeling and promote the atmosphere of cooperation by large measures. The Wisconsin Cooperative statute permits the use of five per cent of the profits of cooperatives in "education." Evidently this fund can be used to create a community solidarity and the intelligence necessary to continued action together.

7. The seventh characteristic of cooperation is that it is a plan of general improvement through improving the marginal and the small man. It would be possible for a limited number of successful men always to get on without collective action, but it is impossible for the poor or indifferent farmer to thrive without it. One might say that cooperatives are organized in his interest, as the representative of all the interests of the community.

8. The eighth element entering into cooperation is that it proceeds by standardization of the goods handled. It was early discovered in cooperative work that only graded and standardized goods could be sold by these societies. They cannot dispose of the unclassified and mixed products which individual farmers have been accustomed to attempt to sell. The standardization is often a chief business of the cooperative. The grade and the standard are carefully guarded and the product is reliably offered to the consumer. This last feature of cooperation may be rather an attainment which was impossible without it than a necessity of the process. For it stands to reason that in any big market of the country where the name of the individual farmer is unknown or forgotten the brand must make the goods known, and behind the brand must be a standard and scale of excellence. To attain this element of success

cooperation is necessary. Collective action in which a large number of men can combine is a necessary condition of doing business in the big market. There is no longer any small market sufficient to maintain many American farms. In the big market there must be a high level assured, maintained, advertised, and guaranteed.

9. The crowning characteristic of the farm cooperative is that it distributes the profits to the individual producer. In consumers' cooperation it distributes the profits to the individual consumer but always to the patron himself, not to the governing group or to the money lender. This last and ever present factor in cooperation is its reason for commending itself to farmers. Theirs is the only industry in which the individual producer survives. The individual farmer can maintain his independent estate and manage it, receive his separate income, and yet enjoy all the gains of collective action which are until now reserved for the owners of shares in trusts and corporations.

The writer believes that in the development of community life the cooperative local has an essential place. Cooperative stores are of value in cities and factory towns, but producers' cooperation is especially necessary in the country, where the producer is the usual type of man. We think, therefore, that, for retaining at home a satisfactory share of the profit, for keeping the control of the industry, without which no independent man is willing to labor, and for cultivating a spirit of independent ambition, for continuing personal property and the zeal of possession, for the production of a high self-respect, the cooperative organization is a suitable agency.

XII

COMMON SCHOOLS

The American public school is devised for the education of marginal minds. Medieval education was of initial not marginal value. It was for the privileged few. In Scotland and in New England at about the same time, in the last decade of the seventeenth century, the Scots Parliament and the General Court of Massachusetts established schools with identical purpose: that in every residential area a school should be provided for all the children. Later, in Massachusetts, the towns found it possible to maintain and develop the public schools best as schools for the poor. At that time they abolished tuition, which had been for a century paid by the well-to-do only. Later the grading of schools with systematic promotion from grade to grade, one grade each term, completed the adjustment of public education to marginal conditions.

The whole structure as we have it in the United States is a scheme in which the unit of measure is the child on the margin of the economic community in that no tuition is charged; the child on the margin of the intellectual community in that the curriculum is adjusted to the purpose of promoting the child one grade each term or year. The whole class is expected to go forward together, which means that the class advances only as fast as the slowest. This marginal character of grade promotion has been modified by individual principals of city schools who permit bright pupils of initial, that is

highest, value to " skip a class " or more. Also school theorists and administrators are studying retardation and planning schools for " defectives " and "ungraded." The desire to serve the pupil of unusual ability, on the background of universal service which must be adjusted to the marginal child, is a factor in the formation of high schools to which only the brighter children are attracted. The high school has long justified itself by its service rendered to the brighter children. It has claimed that the training of leaders is its function.

More fault is found with the public school system in the country than in the city. The friends of the city child very generally approve of the school system and defend it. They demand that it be developed in its own terms. The friends of the country child and students of the country community demand radical reforms in the public school system. They believe that it must undergo a complete change such as no state proposes for the city school. The reason for this is in the transformation that has already taken place in the rural community. The development of the husbandman community out of land farmers through the stage of exploitaition explains this demand for a new form and new spirit in the country schools.

First of all, the one-teacher school is out of date. It was serviceable in the day when households were the only organization in the country. Its range of service is a neighborhood rather than a community. It does not reach all the people in the country who are acquainted or who share a common interest. It does not assemble a sufficient number of children in a modern community to engage the time or interest the mind of a learned teacher. In an old-fashioned community it had often

too many children. Now it has too few because the population of the open country is scanty.

In the second place, the schools graded for towns are out of sympathy with the country. They are city-minded; their directing agents do not think of the farm, nor are they organized to meet its needs. They imitate city conditions in an environment in which city industries and congestion are absent. Their influence upon rural education is either negative or hostile. They furnish a ladder by which the country boy may leave the farm and a standard by which the city may attract to itself boys from farm and village.

In the third place, the teachers in the country, and those who train them for their task, are indifferent to country life. The teachers generally do not reside in the rural community. Even in the case of village and consolidated schools too often the teachers live at a distance and have no vital interest in the community to anchor them there in residence.

The normal schools, at which teachers are trained, are of all the schools we have the most formal and professional. They have in mind securing positions for their pupils rather than interpreting to them great books, the great issues of life and the riches of learning. The teaching in the normal schools with some exceptions is generally more pedantic and traditional than it is in the old-time colleges, the universities, or professional schools. The normal schools compare in their teaching rather to theological seminaries and schools of law. So traditional are they that their graduates seek a job and a salary rather than service to a community. The influence of the normal schools is very great but it is not an influence serviceable to the country people. One state after

another has established a normal school for the training of rural teachers. Almost invariably its resources have been diverted in their use to the preparation of teachers for the city schools.

The fourth dis-service of the public school to country life is in that the curriculum has its source in an outworn tradition. It is a curriculum that looks to the preparation of children to go to college. Originally its ideal was classical and cultural. But for the elementary pupils this outworn curriculum brings no cultural value into the routine of education. The universities have taken the place of the colleges and they dominate now the curriculum of the elementary schools, but the effect is the same. The curriculum is not adapted to the enrichment of community life but to the service of big, distant institutions to which only the privileged can go.

A fifth consideration is the fact that the recent tendency to concentrate public funds upon high schools, to expend unusual amounts upon their buildings, to pay higher salaries to their teachers, is adverse to the community service which all the schools should render.

Add to this the sixth defect of the rural schools, that they do not stimulate but rather suppress individual initiative. Every one who knows the American and who sees him in many communities throughout the land wonders what has become of the inventiveness and originality which he displayed in the pioneer days, which he exhibits on the farm, and when he is in the uniform of a soldier. In war the American is distinguished for his individual boldness, his inventiveness, and his self-reliance; but in the local community the American is obedient to routine standards, is easily deprived of individual opinion, and shows no industrial inventive-

ness. One may travel through one hundred places in the Middle West and the South, where the population is not more than two thousand at any one center, and find no single product locally made. Not one town of a score produces any goods under a local brand or in which the people of the community take pride as their own. Few Americans any longer seems to invent anything or devise anything or promote anything privately. Our products are factory made, produced at large factories, exploited by blatant advertising, and defended by the illusion that only a great combination can produce. Probably this suppression of the individual is in large measure industrial. There is, however, part of it to be laid at the score of our education. At least it may be said that the common schools do not elicit, and we believe they rather suppress, the individuality of the pupil. The writer believes that the high-school routine is dead, sterile, alien, and to most of the children uninteresting.

A seventh disadvantage is that too many who cannot teach can be hired to do it. Teaching is both a genius and a skill. It is born in some; it can be imparted to a limited few. But we Americans have been so eager for education that we take it in any form. Many of those who teach in the school are hirelings, not teachers. The country schools are peculiarly subject to this disadvantage, because for them the untrained teacher, whose only motive is the salary, is alone available. When the state is entrusted with the task of education, when it is assumed that only the state can educate the child as it should be done, it follows naturally that every citizen will think himself qualified to teach and education promptly descends to the level of employment. Men

and women enter it because it is respectable, clean-handed, and well paid. The result is that we have great numbers of teachers who care nothing whatever about the world, know nothing about the great learning, are indifferent to books, whose only motive is securing regular pay.

These faults of the common schools are mentioned because they keep it on a path of its own aside from the track of community development. The whole system of education, both under the state and under private auspices, should be reformed by adjustments to present-day conditions. The most important of these is the adequate supervision of the schools by trained men and women. The supervision is important because for a long time to come the small and scattered country schools will be the only place of education for most of the children. No intelligent educator expects the one-teacher school to be abolished or consolidated in the years immediately to come. These small schools must be served by a super-teacher. Their work must be adjusted to the schools of the town, over which the supervisor should also have charge. The important thing is that to every part of the rural population there should be sent a supervisor trained in the great universities who is prepared to give a professional and an intelligent service in the modern spirit to all the children of the village and of the farm. Whether this supervision comes from consolidation of schools, as in Ohio or Minnesota, or by a system of county supervision under state appointment, as in Maryland, or by state supervision, as in Connecticut, is indeed an important question. Volumes are written upon this educational question. My present purpose is to insist that the teacher who meets the child must be

supervised and directed by a highly-trained man or woman. The schools we have, and are going to have for a generation at least, should be raised to their highest value. This cannot be done without supervision.

Consolidation of schools[1] is proposed as a remedy of the defects of the rural school system. It is indeed a satisfying advance. It puts an end to many of the defects of the rural school. It brings under social control all the children of the country and provides an adequate center for community life. It makes possible higher education suited both to vocational preparation and cultural enjoyment. Consolidation is good in every way. Its case has now been won. In most of the states, so far as convictions are concerned, every advocate of country life is in favor of it because, so far as it may be expected to go, it is good. It is true that there are limits to its use. Some of its advocates have expected more than can be accomplished by an administrative change, — for such it is, — but it more than satisfies reasonable expectation.

The administration of country schools is in most states centered in the county. In some of the older colonial commonwealths administration centers in the state office. The business of administration is essentially financial and practical. The administrator is not a teacher but a business man. We do not, however, put administration first. Its value for the country people is less than either of the reforms just mentioned. But it has a very great usefulness and high promise. It is for the administrator to find the funds and thus to equalize the opportunity for the children in the country with those in the city. His is the problem of supplying

[1] *The Consolidated Rural School*. Rapier. Scribners. 1921.

teachers, and to him is assigned the task of elevating the standards both of supervision and of instruction. School administration is new. Its values have not yet been fully explored. The possibilities of administration as distinct from supervision are very great. Many of the strongest educators are tempted to enter this field because of the higher pay and the great influence offered. Only a few are capable of preserving in an office the spirit of a teacher and of exerting upon the legislator, upon public officials, and upon the teaching profession a humane, practical, and progressive force.

One vital issue has recently arisen which illustrates the place of administrator in rural education. It is proposed that there be a Department of National Education in Washington, with a secretary having a seat in the Cabinet. It is proposed that Congress grant in the first year $100,000,000 to this Department to be expended very largely upon rural education and that of the classes of those now disadvantaged, such as the Negro, Southern mountaineer, the Indian and the immigrant. Very generally teachers have been in favor of this proposal. The reasons given for it are: first, that it would supply funds wherewith to supplement the pitiful salary paid to country teachers; second, it would supplement the funds available for educating the disadvantaged part of the population; third, it is urged that this nationalization of the schools would dignify education.

But there are objections. It is a question whether education should be dignified in that manner. To make the school-teacher a mere public official is of very doubtful good. Government and education are not identical, though the tendency for many years has been to identify

them. Further, it might be better to develop the present Bureau of Education in its service to the Indian and other disadvantaged classes and cautiously to enlarge the Bureau rather than at once to establish a Department. Thirdly, salary increases are a dangerous argument. The tendency in our time, when men feel that the great wealth produced in America is possessed by a few, is to flee to the government for a remedy. Too often the proposed remedy is a bonus or subsidy to be granted to those who have too little and paid through taxation of those who have much. The argument presented for the National Department of Education looks too much like a business argument. It runs in the same terms with the argument that the soldiers in the World War should be given a grant in cash because they wore uniform. Not all teachers earn more than they get. The great need of rural pupils is no convincing argument for higher pay secured for those who are employed to teach them.

Those who doubt the value of a National Department of Education believe that the government is both a dangerous and an inefficient force in education. We have demonstrated that democratic government can do some things but not that government can be a good teacher. Governments are more interested in control than in enlightenment. Already in some of the states laws have been passed which compel the schools to become propagandists for the present form of government. Teachers are unthinkingly favorable to this in most cases. It is easily taken for granted that the commonwealth is identical with the present form of government. One does not of necessity desire a different government if he insists upon his liberty to think as he

pleases about government. Yet in New York State it is possible for the Commissioner of Education to punish a teacher or expel him from the system because he has discussed with his class the different forms of government. This is a result of the war no doubt, but it is also an expression of the present-day faith in government as a solvent of all ills. Whatever may be true elsewhere, in education the objective must be the individual and never the state or the party or the particular set of laws.

If our schools are to be used by the powers that be they can be made the most efficient form of tyranny ever known in the world. The American Government is unlike monarchies and autocracies in which a few rule the whole people. Our government belongs to the people as a whole. It, therefore, penetrates to the motives and the opinions of men. For this reason it is dangerous for the government wholly to possess the schools. The influence of a democracy which owned and controlled the schools could easily be made the most penetrating and withering autocracy, for under it a dominant party would rule not only the actions of men but their opinions and their feelings.

An adjustment which is being made in many states, even where supervision and consolidation have been retarded, is the development of rural high schools. Probably the motive is to correct the marginal character of the common schools which provide an education for all. The rural high school originally had the classical and scholastic tradition of the old line religious college. It appealed only to a few. Less than ten per cent attended and not as many as five per cent passed through the high school. Because of its interest to a few only, the high school is still on trial. It must justify itself.

The rural high school in particular has few conspicuous successes. It has few devoted friends. Theoretically all are in favor of it. Friends of country life look upon the high school as a center of rural culture, knowledge, and skill. As a matter of fact it has produced few great educators. In many states it has no devoted teachers with a gift of interpreting the life of country people to themselves. Great rural teachers have arisen in the old academies and in the fitting schools which succeeded them, but none like these has come up from the expensively equipped and lavishly furnished rural high school. Where is the young educator who gives promise of taking the place of Principal W. P. Webb of Bellbuckle, Tennessee, the beloved "Sawney Webb," whom the Governor sent to the United States Senate as an honored citizen? Where is the New England high-school man who promises to take the place in secondary education of Dr. Endicott Peabody of the Groton School? The public high schools have ampler funds; they have the state administration to support them and sustain them, with public opinion at the present time wholly in their favor. Yet the high school in the country has, so far as national interests go, proven singularly indifferent. If it were, with its greater resources, to occupy the place in modern life which the academies occupied a century ago, families would be moving out into the country towns from the great cities in order to educate their children.

The present writer believes that the snuffing out of individual genius and the suppressing of initiative in boys and girls is largely due to the sterility of the high school. Moral abuses are often discovered in high-school towns. Indeed, they are so frequent as to resemble a national problem. They are probably a natural result of sending

boys and girls to high school who ought to be at work with their hands in physical production. Instead of doing creative work they sit at a desk in the high school which is a school of respectability instead of a school of knowledge or skill. There is reason to believe that we have too profuse high-school provision, too expensive equipment as compared with the ability of the teachers or the ambition of the pupils. The adolescent years from thirteen to eighteen are all-important in the development of personal character, in religious faith, in industrial potency. It would be better if in these years we had a degree of competition among private, religious, and endowed secondary schools, instead of the expenditure of public moneys with a lavish hand upon expensive buildings, equipment, and high salaries for teachers who show no exceptional aptitude or high promise.

For the improvement of rural education the junior high-school reform is especially useful. Six years for elementary work and six for secondary work make a just division of time. Professor David Snedden's plea for the one-teacher school in the country up to the sixth grade only is a wise proposal. If the teacher in the country, professionally untrained as she usually is, but adequately supervised, could be free to teach the little children in their first six years only, she could do a very satisfactory work. To provide for these six years is an unquestioned duty of the state. The monopoly insisted upon by public school educators is justified in these years without reservation. For the second six, the adolescent years, there should be a greater variety of provision. The state and the town should spend their best and their amplest funds upon elementary education. They should

do less proportionately for secondary education, leaving for private agencies a larger field in this quarter where initiative and personal character have their beginnings.

Community education is a great objective in country life. The training of the children and indeed of the adults to life in their own community, to the industries which are there, and to the ideals of the place in which they live, is a great objective. For this community education, we have as yet too few institutions. The schools are hardly to be considered here. The rural high school is generally a disappointment, though in some parts of the Middle West high schools have become local colleges devoted to the need of the community and of their section of the state. We are greatly in need of institutions for community education.

A new thing in education has been devised in America within the two decades of the present century. Dr. Seaman Knapp, an Iowa farmer, in the years after his seventieth birthday, developed the "Demonstration Work" which has been described by his lieutenant, Mr. O. B. Martin, in a volume of that title.[2] This work of Dr. Knapp, promoted by the General Education Board, was taken over by the United States Government in the Smith-Lever Act in the form of County Agent in Agriculture and Home Demonstration Work. Out of it has grown the Farm Bureau. This is a system of popular education by which a man or women, trained usually in the agricultural colleges, brings to the farm and to the local community the best and most appropriate teaching of the schools. He is the local representative of government, of education, of international experience, and of the great markets. At present we

[2] *The Demonstration Work*, by O. B. Martin. The Stratford Co., 1921.

believe that the work of the County Agent is the most promising work in education in America, if not in the world. It served a useful purpose in the World War. What its future will be no man can know. The government has retreated somewhat from the extended and bountiful support of this system, in that Congress has refused appropriation for Home Demonstration Agents employed during the war. Yet the system is unimpaired. Whether it will be able to resist the state politician and to keep itself as free as the public schools have kept themselves from the spoilsman remains to be seen. Probably this system of education will be an advance over what we had before. Possibly it is a revolution in teaching the people in a great time of reconstruction. Certainly the principle worked out by Seaman Knapp with such enthusiasm makes an addition to our knowledge of education, especially to the education of a whole population.

The purpose of this chapter is to say that the system of common schools, which proposed an education for all the children, has many defects in its relation to present-day rural need. It serves country people not so well as it serves those in the cities. It is rigid and static, in too much of its area unbending and incapable of adjustment. I have attempted to designate those places at which its usefulness is greatest and its adjustment is most promising. The test of its value as a common school is the ability of the teacher so to identify himself with the community, that we shall have something in education that will move the pupil to devise, to write, to paint, and to create the products of the hand and the fruits of the land. We have a faulty education until we have something in education that will move the

teacher to dwell contentedly in the community in which he or she teaches, proud of the people and devoted to them rather than to a system and to a salaried list. Where education is so faulty one does not know whether to be in favor of the public schools or to be impatient of them, so great are the changes needed, and so few are the benefits conferred upon the community life in time of change. The wealth of learning which we inherit is very great and is suited to the needs of country people, but it is not being interpreted. The knowledge now possessed in the laboratories and in the university classroom is greatly needed in the villages and towns. But the public school system either stands in the way or does not function to transmit it. Yet it is probable that in this field, especially in the growing class of rural school supervisors, county agents, county superintendents, and state supervisors of rural schools, the hopes of the past are to be realized and the needs of the future met.

CHAPTER XIII

RECREATION AND MORALS

In a changing society we are prone to attempt to control our neighbor overmuch. We put our hand to the ark to steady it when it is shaken by the rough road. Conscious of our newness as a people, Americans have been inclined for several generations past to the improvement of other Americans. This is another form of the national inclination to entertain one idea at a time. It goes to extremes in movements for the betterment of our fellows in the field of moral conduct.

It is very doubtful whether we can improve other men by a social plan. Human society is so intricate and conduct is so delicately balanced. Our knowledge is small and our own motives are mingled of good and bad elements, so that the wisest philosophers doubt the possibility of improving any one or bettering any society by a deliberate social plan. Undeterred by this doubt which many common people share, we are devotedly organized for the improvement of our fellows. The writer believes that negative good has been done in the world by the abatement of abuses, but that the positive moral advances appear to have resulted from the contact of the genius or inspired man with the rest of the people. Artists, poets, and prophets are the source of positive good.

On the other hand, we require a machinery for idealization. We cannot wait for geniuses to be born or for prophets to speak. Every community has the acute

problem of surviving, of keeping its high standards intact and of training the young, the newcomer, and the alien in a developing idealism. This machinery is the school and the church and the playground. Of these three the playground is the liveliest, most dynamic machine for making people idealize their necessary life and submit to its demands.

To be good means to be acceptable in that community and useful in its local problem of survival. The community wants to continue, to grow, to extend, to keep alive and to have a future. Everybody wants this. It is an aspiration common to all. The man who helps the community to live is a good man. Much more can be said and various moralists will add their particular definition to goodness but we believe that socially speaking the good man is he who fits and is useful to the universal purpose. The good man's conception of himself and of the community, when it is commonly accepted, is an ideal.

Ideals are the approving reflection of our own life within its conditions and its limits. We idealize our necessities. The soldier sings of his sordid, revolting trade. The working man sounds the praises of labor. The merchant swells his chest when he speaks of trade and industry. We all think complacently of the conditions of our own life, however hard they be. These thoughts are ideals.

It would be a waste of time to praise and approve the process of idealism. It is a normal process of life. In the country men and women have inferior institutions of idealization. The farmhouse ought to be a machinery for idealizing the life of the farm. Its hospitality should idealize the lonely road; its joy of eating and drinking,

the production of food; its warmth and comfort, the cold and hardship. There should be pictures on the wall and musical instruments in the living room of the farmhouse which exhibit country life as an artist alone can show it. Too often the farmhouse is a place of sordid toil. Too frequently the women think of themselves as producers alone and not as beautifiers and utilizers of that which the household group produces. Their production is of less value than their consumption. The house, where the woman rules, should be the place of satisfactions.

There are false ideals as well as true ones. We often project an idea which we think should be true and assert that it is fact. School-teachers and preachers are given to the projection of their ideas upon reality. They act as if all men used books, which are a condition of their own life. They talk as if all men were learned. Because they think that all men should use books and be learned, they take it for granted that they are learned. This is not idealism. I would call it idea imposition. But, whatever it is, it is all too common.

We are given to imposing our ideals on other persons. It is permitted to the members of a household group to impose their ideals upon younger and weaker members. This we believe is for their good. Whether good or not, no one will interfere. It is permitted in a community that some impose their ideals upon their neighbors. But here the domination does not go unquestioned. In the larger population units, the imposition of an ideal is indignantly opposed. In other words, the dominion of goodness has limits.

The moral condition of rural communities is superficially good. Personal property is respected. The

standards of home life are unquestioned now, though a century ago they were in doubt and their modification was a matter of public concern. But nowadays the integrity of the person is reasonably secure in the open country and in the village whether it be of man, woman or child. So far as the requirements of a society unchanging and static are concerned, rural morality is everywhere fairly satisfactory. The defect is in the changing condition of modern society. Property is respected, but contracts are not yet respected among farmers as they are among business men. The buying and selling and the agreements of workman with employer are still rather shaky. Of these the texture of business is made up. It is in these respects that country life is undergoing rapid change and general improvement. At this point machinery for modifying the social life of the country should be erected.

In spite of the general respect for the household group and its ethical code, farmers at least are rather coarse and prudish in their mention of the processes of sex and mating. The American countryman is still averse to that free discussion which centers in the universities, the theaters and the other dynamic organizations where thought and feeling are undergoing rapid change. You will not see on the reading table of a farmer's or a villager's house the books which even young women are discussing in the cities. The solid advantage and the incidental gains of this discussion are not for country people. Until this discussion of the sex experience and feeling is made possible, the deliberate adjustment of family life to the modern spirit will be deferred. It may be that the rural household will imitate the household spirit of the towns: however, only by free discussion

and deliberate adaptation to its own environment can the change be made which is necessary. The family group in the country is small, as it is in the town. Marriage is deferred, though not so long as in the case of the urban pair. Children, in sections where exploitation of land has come, are few. Adjustments involved in these facts will modify the farm family. We must have social machinery for effecting this adjustment decorously and with precision to the changed form of social life in the country.

Another evil of country life is the general incapacity of the farmer to cooperate, with all that collective action involves. First of all, the farmer will not willingly recognize the demands of a market. He resents requirements of the market agent which his own family experience does not impose. He fails at the first to see the reasonableness of rules made by city men in the packing of apples or the shipping of milk. The past ten years have been for the American farmer like a school period in the lessons of marketing. In the end the deposit will be ethical. The rules of the game are first imposed, then learned, then adopted, and finally idealized. We have not yet come to the time when producers of food think well of the requirements of the market and of the middleman. Yet there is every moral reason why he should welcome these requirements and make them a part of his ethical code.

Another feature of the economic modification is thrift in the use of materials. Waste of foodstuffs, timber, hides, cotton, wool, has been an abuse of American life on which all observers from older lands have commented. At the beginning this waste was not wrong. Americans had to destroy the virgin forest in order to plant the soil.

They were forced to destroy certain species of wild animals, like the buffalo, in order to fence the prairie and plant it. But the process of timbering off the forest and of killing the wild game is soon touched with pathos. The moral condemnation of all observers is visited upon the lumberman who exploits the forest and wastes its wealth and upon the game butcher who fifty years ago shot down buffalo for their hides, leaving carcasses to rot, and destroyed the elk for the selling-price of their teeth.

The whole economic process is being swiftly modernized. Society is demanding to be heard in the conserving of the soil, preservation of the forest and the reforesting of the mountain slopes, in the preserving of the species economically valuable like the salmon, or precious to the sentiment like the wild goose and the wild duck. We are not willing that these should be wasted. We are as a nation more resolved each decade that the process of tilling the soil and producing raw materials shall be carried on in obedience to standards of the whole community and not of the individual lumberman or farmer. The writer has seen the battlefields of France over which the whole world is called by the fine spirit of the French nation to lament. Years before he had seen the naked and impoverished slopes, hills, and mountains in Pennsylvania. He was unable to grieve over the soil of France, blasted by war, any more deeply than over the hillsides of Pennsylvania exploited by the wasteful hand of the lumberman. The essential economic state in France and Pennsylvania is the same. The first difference is in the wisdom and maturity of the French people. The impoverishment of Pennsylvania is as heavy a burden upon the state as the devastation of France, but Pennsylvanians are too crude to see it. The other

difference is that the devastation of Pennsylvania can be more easily borne for the present.

Another chief defect in the moral code of country people is in the austerity and hardness of the common mind. Opinions are authoritative rather than reasonable. The moral standards of the pioneer days, established and extended in the time of household farming, still assert themselves with cruel and unquestionable domination. One reason for this is the extensive authority given to the head of the farm family, by the struggle for an income during the past fifty years. The family group has been forced to work together, to sacrifice everything and to obey one single will. This will is the will of a man on the average between forty-five and sixty-five years of age. The predominance of the older man above fifty years of age is emphasized by the traditional nature of farming. Social life in the country is elder-governed. Under the sense of need and struggle it has been more concentrated in the hands of the older and of the male during the past two generations than in the preceding period. This kind of rule is hard, material, unsympathetic and austere.

A force that has extended itself to almost national limits is the measurable influence of Puritanism. I suppose the results of the Civil War are seen in this as a part, but the predominance of New England ideas and of the moral tradition inherited through New England is now almost universal throughout the country. Its extension may be measured by the growth of the prohibition movement. In this case the motives were in part economic. The farmer was determined to protect his laborers from the use of alcoholic liquor. The Puritanism of the movement showed itself in its traditional sentiment

and its moral judgment that good may be demanded of the people of a community by legal and social control.

There is a moral defect characteristic of country people as they face national changes, which profoundly troubles the teacher and the minister. It is the lack of respect for scientific truth as such. This is not because of ignorance. There is in cities quite as much or more of dense ignorance concerning the truths of modern biology and engineering, but cities are demanding engineers and contractors to do the thinking on these matters. The country is dominated by farm owners who do not have to consult scientifically trained engineers. They therefore have not yet faced the implications of scientific advance in agriculture. They do not realize how far-reaching are the discoveries in biology, chemistry, and economics, which are transforming the life of the country. In some places this domination of the country by the traditions of the past is the cause of American attacks upon scientific teaching. Legislatures have been moved to consider laws against the teaching of evolution. Orators fulminate against college and high-school instructors. Preachers, taught in the tradition of the past, denounce those who lead astray the young members of their flock. There is only one reason why this parochial conservatism is of real weight. That reason is that the country is more democratic, and the small owner has more authority there than in the cities.

Fearful of this denunciation, high-school teachers and ministers who have been trained in the universities are too often silent about what they believe. The result is that we have the paradoxical situation: education in modern biology lives in the high-school laboratory

while medieval theology rules the church and the political platform.

The condition we are describing is undergoing rapid change. Some of the evils mentioned will be modified by forces now at work. The purpose of this chapter is to present an organization of the local community which, with a minimum of discussion and discord, will be capable of adjusting the moral standards of the people of the country to the needs of the modern time. This adjustment will be brought about, we believe, by adequate social intercourse and mingling, by frequent contact of the few who think with the many who merely imitate; by discovery and release of varieties of individuals in the community; by increased freedom of intiative for persons now suffering from domination; by the introduction of world forces into the pent-up life of the small community; and by the development of pleasure-taking, volitional expression and joy. We believe that these needs will be attained in the contact of the individual with the largest possible number of other individuals of different types in the primary group, either the neighborhood or the community.

Play is the social machinery for idealizing work. The leisure-time experiences of the community may be organized through play in such a way as to beautify and ennoble the toil. The older recreation of the household farm days was proper to the society of that time. It generally took the form of a countryside gathering at a farmhouse in which the interest centered in an industrial process turned to the uses of play. It was a husking-bee or a spelling-match, a wood-chopping bee or a sewing-bee. All these were idealizations of work. Young men and women or their elders assembled for social enjoy-

ment and dignified some task by making it the business of the day. This was the truest recreation. Probably nothing we have invented in later times is of more value, even to a later society. A community house is an untried investment as compared to a husking-bee. Our trouble in modern times is that we cannot continue the husking-bee. It does not fit our present needs. But certain elementary processes are good now as they were then. For instance, it is good for any people to get together and talk. Whatever play organization, therefore, makes men talk helps them to idealize their life. They discuss with endless joy the particular experiences they have. They weigh and value the right and the wrong in big and little. They learn to love or to hate one another and thus exercise themselves in neighborly experience.

Next after talk as an element in recreation is eating and drinking. It should be elementary and universal as a factor in recreative organization among country people. For a society devoted to the production of food should eat together. It is morally good for them thus to idealize their toil. As a matter of fact all country communities enjoy eating and drinking as a characteristic social experience. They are as a rule hospitable, and the crudest backwoods dweller is unashamed in asking to his table the passer-by. He is offended only if the guest fails to appreciate the food he offers.

The third factor in all rural recreation is music. It should be always present in a program of community moral training. Those communities in America which matured and perfected the household group in the decades before the Civil War sang the song of their ideals. Their ears caught the words of " Home, Sweet

Home" and "Swanee River" from the lips of the poet and made them popular because these songs idealized the life of their time. Our generation, alas, has no rural poetry. The exploiting of the farm has produced only the caustic criticism of Hamlin Garland and the hopeless pessimism of Sherwood Anderson. We have not yet idealized the life of the village and of the farm. As soon as we do we will, as a people, burst into song. For the present the meetings of country people should be beautified with the songs of the larger society. It is better to sing about the city and about the foreign land than not to sing at all. How pitiful and sordid are the hymns in the ragged revival song-book scattered over the benches of a country church. How mirthless and joyless are the rhyming jingles of an " all-day sing " in a rural section of the South. The only satisfaction from their use is a melodious noise. There is nothing good to remember. No moral record is made, because they do not idealize the life of the people who sing them.

Dramatics are a kindred form of country play which school the mind in the goodness of the life about. In not a few country places the community house has a stage. There are rural communities in which music is impossible but dramatic expression is a success. Publishers are putting forth an increased number of simple plays for use in the country. The dramatic vehicle is being adjusted to the use of small groups of players. Even where the story of the play has no real significance, the experience of acting together helps to idealize country life because in the isolated life of the farm and the social clash of the village, collective action is a blessing. It shows to each member, not in word but in deed, that the community is one.

Probably no other element in rural recreation is so important as the celebration of holidays. These are themselves memorials of some great event or person whom the people idealize. The birthday of Washington has a holy place in the year. The Fourth of July has a moral value in reminding us that freedom is sacred. We think well on these days of the conditions of life of Washington and the founders of the Republic. It is morally good therefore to celebrate these days. It tends to the building of a good people. We will be wise if we follow the example of the Hebrews, who have many holy days.

The great nations have generally, we believe, modified their austerity by relaxations and times of leisure. These periods of release are filled with celebrations which remind the individual of the past of the nation, arouse his feeling of pride, increase his fellowship and extend his loyalties in every way, and thus develop in him a national personality. This is what we need to do in the community. The celebration of holidays, even as we now have them, would be a form of Americanizing the community to which we are unaccustomed. It would bring forward the old and retarded minds, it would draw out from the foreigner his beginnings of interest in the country and would ripen them into patriotism. It would initiate the young in citizenship; and it would discover leaders who once disclosed to themselves would freely develop their personality.

Beyond this the play experiences of a country community go forward in handmade and homely ways under the general title of "community projects." Every worker in a country community has his own story to tell. The project may be the mere caring for a poor family,

harvesting the crop, care of a sick man or building, a sidewalk by the road. Whatever it is the project has the effect of socializing. It discovers leadership, it discloses personality to the eyes of the largest audience. It appeals to joy and will rather than to routine. These projects have a higher value than in towns because they bring people together and away from solitary routine. They mend some sore hurt in the common life. There is a public quality in them that lifts a man above himself. So they are refreshing. Blessed be he who knows how to plan them, propose them, and carry them through to a successful end, and a happy remembrance! Sorry the country town that cannot get together to clear a playground, to excavate for the foundation of a teacherage, or to harvest the crop for a widow in the season of her bereavement! These things are the play of the spirit.

The greatest moral gains are in collective play. Team work idealizes common life, in practice of its leadership, its obedience, its sacrifice and its honor. On the arena of baseball or football all may see the beauty of the daily competitive struggle. Men go home from the games grimly satisfied with life. It is a mimicry of life, and life is the better lived because of it.

Through ideals the moral experiences of play "carry over" into work and business. It was, we are told, on the playground at Eton that Waterloo was won. There are so many books[1] concerning school playgrounds, and play apparatus that it is not necessary to treat those problems here. Henry S. Curtis has made play both a philosophy and a technique. Mrs. Bancroft has stored

[1] *Play and Recreation for the Open Country*, H. S. Curtis. The Macmillan Co. *Games for the Playground*, Mrs. Bancroft. The Macmillan Co. *A Country Center*, Henry E. Jackson. U. S. Bureau of Education.

out of the Normal and Industrial Institute wrote and staged "The Mountain Maid." At first every one was indifferent; but the noble dramatic sentiments of the piece stirred their hearts. The enthusiasm of Miss Emily Hoag, the author, and of her comrade aroused them. In the end the play was a great success, just because life in that bright, hard, austere city needed idealization. "The Mountain Maid" helped them to be good in terms of their home town.

The community theater is a recent development. Mr. Alfred G. Arvold of Fargo, North Dakota, has been its conspicuous champion. He has done national service as the wise pioneer in this movement for dramatizing common life. There are many imitators and lesser leaders in the community theater movement. In colleges, schools, churches, and lodges plays are written, rehearsed, and presented. They are always a local adventure. The rehearsing and the acting are great fun. They are frequently local in their theme, content and scene.

The community house is the crowning expression of the spirit and of the practice of modern recreation. Among the agencies of the small town it is the highest modern expression of husbandry. When it is beautifully built, well managed and used by everybody, it is the most fitting expression of modern country life. My students brought me word in 1916 of such a house in Vernon, New Jersey, and we set out to investigate it. The more we learned of it the better we liked it. The home of a Board of Trade, which included nearly every person in the community, it was for several years a power that penetrated to each household and followed every interest. No single leader could be found. By

careful sifting of evidence we reduced the problem of leadership to the confines of four families. The ownership of the building was for a long time mysterious. Like the leadership, no one claimed it. But finally we found that the community house was the property of St. Anne's Episcopal Church!

Four years after the students again visited Vernon — but how changed! The dances in the hall were now condemned by one church and ignored by another. The Board of Trade was gone, the delightful evenings when the house was filled in every room, were no more. The cause of these changes — why had the community house lost its community and instead of a house become a low hall? The cause as before we could not ascertain. But we were told while we were in Vernon that two old persons in the four families had died, that one of the four families had moved away, the schoolmaster had gone to the war, and the two churches had changes of pastor. Yet for a time the community house in Vernon had been an expression of a high unity in American life. Those who knew it then will not forget.

The Department of Agriculture in Washington has published two pamphlets on community houses[2] which record the growth of the movement and its relation with the growth of churches and schools. Probably this rapid expression was a consequence of war experience. Why indeed should we not do for our home town what we did for the soldier in camp? The perfect democracy, the freedom of access, simplicity and practical usefulness of the "huts" which the Y. M. C. A. and other war-service agencies erected and maintained in the "out-

[2] *Rural Community Buildings in the United States*, by W. C. Mason and C. W. Thompson, Bulletin 825. U. S. Dept. of Agriculture, July, 1920. Also: *Community Halls*, Bulletin 273, Ontario Dept. of Agriculture, 1919.

fits" of the army are just what the rural community needs. The one-time soldier now is a farmer, a clerk, or a laborer, and his moral needs are as great as ever. His temptations are greater; for his freedom is now absolute. When he was under a drill-sergeant, an army surgeon, and a military policeman, the war-service agencies taught him "morale," that is, they helped him to idealize life in an army. He needs now a community house, in which life and wages in a small town may be idealized. Peace-time morale is more important to the community than fighting edge.

XIV

COMMON WORSHIP

The worship of God is an expression of the consciousness of kind. "This consciousness is a social and a socializing force, sometimes exceedingly delicate and subtle in its action; sometimes turbulent and all-powerful. Assuming endlessly varied modes of prejudice and of prepossession, of liking and disliking, it tends always to reconstruct and dominate every mode of association and every social grouping." [1] This description by Professor Giddings is so near to a description of worship, that it is startling.

Of all human acts of the conscientious man worship is the most highly symbolic. They who worship are alike, and in their likeness are unlike to others. It is an expression of their awareness of resemblance and of difference. The definitions of consciousness of kind, as a sociological process, go a long way to explain, without further comment, both the strength and the weakness of the churches in America.

The churches have to struggle with a narrow and small social horizon. Few people are so conscious of their kinship with all others in their community that they desire those others to worship with them. The sense of unlikeness to others is, unfortunately, as strong in their feelings as the sense of likeness unto their own. In the American community with many newcomers, and some foreigners, this sense of unlikeness is natural. It is not to be wondered that men should think themselves more

[1] *Descriptive and Historical Sociology*, by Prof. Franklin H. Giddings, p. 275.

like unto their old neighbors than unto the new. It is not surprising that with new economic processes men should ignore their unity with those who cooperate with them in getting a living, and should be conscious of their unity with those whose living comes in the same form. As a result, we have working men's churches and "rich men's clubs," "college churches," "student pastors," churches which minister to old families, and new chapels built by tenant farmers. But these phases of worship are peculiar to the times of transition in which we live. The immaturity of our economic processes, and the greater immaturity of our economic knowledge, explain the failure of worshiping people to assemble by communities; but the process which assembles men of kindred mind to worship together now is capable of bringing men together in larger wholes.

The spirit of federation is in the air. The longing for religious unity is a response to the stimuli of common experience in the same locality. Men who meet throughout the week, if they worship at all, discover a desire to worship together. The coming of great occasions and the celebrations of anniversaries, train them in some common assemblies. I remember how the tidings of the death of President McKinley brought together all the people of the community in an act of worship. Their response to a profound sense of danger was a community response, and the church which was prompt to open its doors, found men of all faiths within.

The consciousness of kind is an awareness of differences and resemblances. It is a finding of oneself among those to whom one is like, and an aversion to those unto whom one is not like. Worship is an expression of this common likeness. It is an enjoyment of fellowship.

Simmel teaches that religion is the resultant of the reactions of the individual with his group fellows, and with the group as a whole. Christian folk are accustomed to express this by calling one another " brothers " and " sisters," meaning clearly that religion is a social experience.

In country communities this principle explains the divisions and the unities of religious life. In many towns, the Presbyterian church, for instance, is the church of the old settler and the earlier farmers. A new denomination has come in with the tenants and the invaders. That is, men have found it impossible to worship in a constant experience of difference. It is true that their difference is an element in their religion, because the consciousness of difference is an element in the consciousness of kind.

In the Southern States, the white slave-holders worshiped, before the war, in the same congregations with their Negro slaves. They were conscious of the plantation group, and of the economic unity with their workpeople. When emancipation came and the slaves were made free, they must needs worship apart; and today, throughout the whole South, the Negro churches have been erected to express the consciousness of kind, both on the part of the white and of the black.

If this argument has force, it goes to prove that religion is, in a small community, the strongest organizing force. The seeking after God requires, as a vehicle, the consciousness of likeness and difference. It can only proceed along those lines.

The true consciousness of kind must be economic and social. There is no escape from this for religious people. They must go deep down to the unities with men who

cooperate with them in getting a living. The Pittsburgh mill owner has no other unity by which he can find himself at one with his foreign born mill-hand, than the fact that he and the mill-hand are fellow workers in the mill.

What other bond of union is there between the farm landlord and the farm tenant? They have no common idealism. The one reads books, the other does not. The one sends his son to college, the other sends his into the stable and the field. The one is enjoying a life of leisure and his hands are clean; the other sweats, saves, and produces, in soiled clothing, and with hard, coarse hands. They have only one basis of unity, namely, that they cooperate in tilling the soil, and in the producing of food and raw materials. The teacher, or preacher who attempts in this case to escape the economic unity, will find no other.

The trouble with most of the ideals which express themselves in diversified worship is that they are peculiar to the life of leisure, they are a part of "the leisure class standard." Many teachers and preachers reiterate demands which can only be responded to by people who do not have to work.

From this leisure class standard our ideals must be changed to the standard of work, and the man who has vision is he who sees the economic, the industrial unities, and who, with compelling voice, will call men together to worship in a new consciousness of kind.

Ministers in the country are feeling this very deeply. The pastor who ministers to a whole community, boasts of it. He realizes he is serving a true social unit. This is the joy of many country churches which might be named, and the lack of it is the blight of many other

country communities. It must be clearly borne in mind, however, that the church cannot organize a unity that is apart from the life of men. Religion is the expression of social realities. There can be no "federation" of those who are not conscious of their likeness and of their resemblances. This means that the religious teaching of days to come must be a teaching of the real unities of mankind. For in these true bonds of union men are brought together. The efforts to assemble them in artificial bonds, however ideal, will be futile.

In counting the community forces many writers leave the church out of their reckoning. The reason for this is that the church is the social agency appointed to deal with the Unknown. The proper social duty of the church is the care of mankind in the face of death, marriage, sin, poverty, and the other recognized invasions of human society by the Unknown. These all are uncomfortable and unpleasant topics for social writers to handle. I do not know any sociological chapter on death as a social force. But when religious sociology is written it will be the first chapter. Until we clearly recognize and measure the service of the church to mystery the present avoidance of religious work on the part of those who enumerate the social forces will continue.

We are indebted to Walter Rauschenbusch, speaking casually in discussion, for the recognition of the church's relation to these mysterious invasions of life by the Unknown. He insisted that the first service the church must render, which no other agent of society can render, is to prepare men for death, to strengthen and steady those who suffer the loss of their friends by death, and to provide the social man with poise, confidence, com-

fort in all the impacts of death upon him. The minister and the church have other duties. In recent years they have been called upon to do many important things, and to justify their place in society by useful services, many and varied. But the first use of the church, and the most frequent function performed by the minister is that of conducting funeral services. The importance of it must not be neglected. Most of the doctrines that the preacher develops in the pulpit are intended to prepare men for death. They are appeals to faith rather than demonstrations of fact. The preacher talks about the crucifixion, the resurrection, about eternal life after the grave. He holds up the symbols of heaven and he commands obedience to certain rather arbitrary rules, the explanation of which is only to be had when one understands that the preacher and pastor, with the church in which he is the chief factor, are maintained by society for use in the events of life occasioned by the Unknown. The first of these must always be the social experience of death.

We are not here discussing the truth of the doctrines that the preacher advocates, nor the intellectual appeal of the formulas he uses in the case of solemnity and fear. The point is — he is the agent of society appointed to confront death and to lead men in such performances as shall steady their nerves, moderate their behavior, enable them to endure the fears and surprises, the alarms and confusions, which they suffer when the Unknown breaks into social life. If this service were not rendered by the churches, human society would have to invent societies to perform it. No minister should, therefore, think of himself as a social worker among the poor, on behalf of the prisoner, or in a com-

munity house. He is a social worker first of all when he performs a funeral service. His prayer book is a symbol committed to him by society; his creed is another symbol entrusted to him. The sociological value of both of these is greater than the value of his work in a parish house, in which he may sit at his desk.

Marriage is another invasion of human life by the Unknown. It is the working of forces incalculable from which there is no escape. In civilized countries marriage is under the social control of the church. The minister is for the performance of the marriage service a magistrate. The reason for this assignment to the church and the parish priest is that the mating of the man and the woman is the result of forces which men fear. Marriage is today beautiful and ideal in our minds, but in itself it is neither beautiful nor comfortable. Men and women marry in obedience to profound mysterious forces which they cannot resist. These forces come armed with tragedy. With one hand they come prepared to kill; with the other to degrade those who are not prepared for them. It is the duty of the church in human society to regulate the relations of men and women and to build the household.

Lawmakers approach this social institution with fear and reserve. Generally they leave it alone if they can because like death it is beyond human control. The family is a social form created by forces partly unknown and wholly incalculable. The parish minister often does not exercise his function in relation to marriage as extensively as he ought, because generally ministers do not understand how much they are trusted with the whole confidence of man and woman in the act of love. Churchmen of insight realize this. Preachers

insist upon their right to denounce evil practices that threaten the family. They lay down rules of conduct, apparently arbitrary at times, which are obviously intended to protect the existing form of marriage. It is granted to the ministers by public opinion to have the first say in all things connected with marriage. These things are so because society recognizes that the minister as a social worker, and the church as a social institution, have entrusted to them the care of that mysterious and uncontrollable thing we call the home. The new scientific studies in genetics should be of value to parish ministers, above all men, because they contribute something to the knowledge we have of the experiences of mating — which still remains mysterious.

It is well to note in passing that the social service rendered in the face of mystery is usually by symbol or by a performance in the field of manners. There is nothing we can do when they have died whom we loved and esteemed except to go and sit together at a service called the burial service. When our friends are married we attend a symbolic performance called a wedding, at which it is not the custom for the minister to preach but to read a service. The more experienced ministers use symbols and behaviors, rather than discourses, at both wedding and funeral. There is no logical explanation for symbol. Its relation to the event is sometimes arbitrary and often accidental; but it has a place because those served are confronting the Unknown. The symbol has its highest value in religion. It must not be despised or neglected, because there is nothing to take its place. Logical and reasonable explanations in the face of the Unknown are futile, and sometimes they are offensive.

The great danger from which the church should save society is the danger of superstition, bigotry and evil practices consequent upon ignorance. We who are Jews or Catholics or Protestants believe that our religion is a religion of intelligence. The development of Jewish-Christian civilization has been attained by continuous applications of intelligence to the social occasions in which fear, terror, and confusion drive men before the face of mysteries. The priests and religious leaders of the past five thousand years have rendered the service of steadying mankind in the face of the Unknown. They have done it by the application of reason and fact, so far as these can be applied to religious process. They have thus in a measure eliminated superstition, controlled fear and produced a morality suitable to the needs of society.

This service is much needed by country people who handle the raw stuff of nature. The Unknown is constantly disturbing the life of rural communities, breaking down the poise and weakening the industrial morale of people upon whom the strain of life is heavy. Outbreaks of religious frenzy have been very common in the past twenty years. They are not, properly speaking, revivals but rather the frenzy and ruin of family and community life through loneliness, fear and trouble. Men and women cry out, fall on the ground, roll about and grovel on the earth in an agony of feeling. The preachers on these occasions are not educated men, as in revivals a century earlier. They are generally ignorant and hysterical people. Their vogue is a natural consequence of the neglect of country people by educated leaders and responsible churches.

Human society is invaded also by the mystery of sin.

No one can explain the moral breakdown of a bank president who defaults, or of the daughter of a responsible family who goes wrong. It is the proper business of the church to restore these individuals, seeking them out where they have been driven apart by society, causing them to repent and make restitution, bringing them back to their places in society, and pleading their right to restoration. The community cannot do this itself. The common mind is capable only of condemnation. Its code of propriety can only be offended or appeased. It cannot, except through the church or other specialized agency, extend forgiveness. What a pity it is when a church or minister forgets or neglects to care for the moral variant, for no one else will go near him. If churches have only condemnation or denunciation for the sinner, then so far as society is concerned, he is lost indeed.

It is because of this function committed to the church that ministers, in obedience to a true instinct, preach so generally upon moral questions. They often become tiresome. If a community finds a minister to be a mere drill-master with no religious feeling of forgiveness in his human system, with no milk of human kindness about him, it should properly resent his moral orders and repel his thunders. The business of thundering and denouncing is true social service only provided it is the public form of private mercy, evangelism, and restoration. For the rabbi, priest, or minister is an agent of society in caring for the sinner. He must never forget that sin is a mystery and only he can perform the solemn duty entrusted to the church of preparing the souls of men to face sin and to behave as they ought.

In recent times ministers and churches have sought

to mould the conduct of the members of the community by organizations of the leisure time, play facilities, and other means of regulating conduct, easing the shock, and preparing the young men and women for the mysterious play of moral forces. These are well in their place, but the churches are not alone in doing them; therefore they are not so exclusively religious as those older services of the parish priest in which he stands alone as an agent of society commissioned to seek and restore the sinner.

Poverty is another invasion of human society by the Unknown. The well-to-do think there is an easy explanation of the condition of the poor. To them it is a result of laziness and improvidence. They are complacent and disregardful of the poverty of their neighbors. These explanations satisfy no one but themselves. The poor know that neither poverty nor riches can be explained. They are not earned or deserved, they are mysterious. Even if on occasion we may understand the poverty or wealth of one individual, we cannot explain to the community as a whole why there is poverty and why there is excessive wealth. The church, therefore, has a duty and commission from society to help the poor endure their poverty and help the rich behave as they ought. This is accomplished primarily by symbols. The act of visiting a prisoner or calling upon a poor man and sitting by his side is no more than a symbol. It is, by itself, a futile and unreasonable thing to do. The visit does not open the prison door nor does it make the poor man to prosper. It is an expression of the desire of society that those who experience the mysterious power shall behave themselves as they ought.

The community church tries to help a poor man

idealize his poverty. It tries to stimulate his children to better their condition. It stirs hope and ambition in the convert. In fact, church people have been as a class successful in either moderating their poverty, escaping the clutches of pauperism, or in attaining a competence. Not a few have become rich. There must be some influence of the churches upon the mysterious experience of poverty. Certainly there ought to be, and if it be admitted that poverty is mysterious, that it is a result of incalculable forces in society, then the social function of the church is to help men to understand poverty and to endure it.

But if the church has a relation to poverty, it has an equal duty in these days to those who have wealth, not in their universal human need, but in their special capacity as rich men and women. No one denies that the minister should help the poor to endure their poverty. There are many who object to the minister attempting the same service toward the rich. Yet if poverty and wealth are mysteries, if their sources are in the Unknown, then it is his duty to help the rich use their money. He should be a student of economics. If he blunders in his expressions, this is not to be resented. The wisest economists are often mistaken. There is a difference of opinion among the best trained men. The important thing is that the minister testify to the seriousness, indeed the awfulness of the differences between men in the world. He must demand a dutiful and useful life on the part of the rich and take no refusal. To do this, he does not require to be greatly skilled, though he is responsible for the attaining of such knowledge and practical wisdom as a student can secure and a man of judgment may attain. Whatever his skill or the lack of it,

however, he is bound to perform this service. Probably his blunders in dealing with the rich will be no greater than his blunders in dealing with the poor. They should not be resented in one case more than the other. Indeed this service is now a part of the discipline of the church. Individual ministers may shrink from it, but preachers on the whole throughout the country are resolute and persistent in their assertion that the church is a trustee of this mystery also. They do something to put the fear of God into the rich. Indeed it is a question whether ministers of the past two decades have not done more to give rich men a sense of duty than to give the poor a sense of submission and of meekness.

Religion very naturally is a school of manners. If what has been said here is true, then we as social beings can, in the face of the Unknown, do no more than behave ourselves as our faith would require. If the church is a socializing agent entrusted with the experiences of the Unknown, then the church will be a place where men learn to behave. This is for the moment taking no account of the absolute truth of the things taught in churches but only of the utility of these teachings. The church renders a service in teaching manners. A minister ought to be a man of good breeding. This is the reason for it. If he is going to teach others he has to know how to behave. He must have poise, steadiness, and practical wisdom. But above all he must have an instinct well-trained unto the end of suitable behavior for every occasion.

These considerations explain a great deal of the character of the church as a social institution. They justify a very natural exclusion of the church from social reckoning by the superficial social thinkers, — who do

not think but are social workers. Naturally the church is not included in their reckoning. It is included in the analysis of human action by the great sociologists. However, the social agent that has to do with mystery will be valued; for most of his life is in the domain of the Unknown. Only slowly and in a limited area of our life do we come to know, to record, to measure, and to teach. Education gradually claims what once belonged to religion. Hospitals, colleges, and schools are erected on what before was consecrated ground. There will be room enough left for the mysterious and plenty of work for the trustee of mystery still to do. In the development of human society the churches will always be appointed to a place which men respect, reverence, and generally avoid, but to which they know that in the great times of life in the day of fear and confusion they must come for guidance.

Those who love the church are eager to have it become a community church. They desire it to be an agent of all the people dwelling together in a place. The service of the church to the Unknown is a community service. There is nothing sectarian about it. All these functions of the church in respect to death, marriage, sin, and poverty are interdenominational. The forms they take are older than the forms of the denominations whose ministers use them. The symbols used are generally current among religious people. Indeed, most of the sects invented in recent centuries have forgotten to provide themselves with special sacraments or forms for death, marriage, and the other invasions of society by the Unknown. Pretty generally Protestant ministers use the oldest forms of burial and marriage which are derived from a Catholic tradition. There is no denomi-

national way to make a visit to a poor family. It is in form non-sectarian. The Jew, the Catholic and the Baptist would visit a man in prison in the same manner. The whole community is interested in every act by which a church or its minister symbolizes the Unknown and helps the community to meet it.

Attendance upon funeral services is quite non-sectarian. The restoration of a sinner or the moral denunciation of a sinner is an act to which the whole community pays instant attention. The minister who is a friend of the poor will promptly find himself beloved and honored by everybody because he brings comfort to the whole society in which he labors. It does not matter what his sect be, he will find himself a community pastor if he makes himself serviceable to the poor of the community. The reason of it is that he has performed the trusteeship which religion holds for the mysterious and unknown under the inevitable organization of society.

A LIST OF COUNTRY LIFE BOOKS

Rural Sociology

Anderson, Wilbert L., The Country Town. Doubleday, Page Co.
Boyle, James E., Rural Problems in the U. S. A. C. McClurg & Co.
Buck, S. J., Grange Movement. Harvard University Press.
Buell, Jennie, The Grange Master and the Grange Lectures. Harcourt, Brace & Co.
Burr, Walter, Rural Organization. Macmillan Co.
Butterfield, Kenyon L., Chapters in Rural Progress. University Chicago Press.
Campbell, John C., The Southern Highlander and His Home Foundation. Russell Sage.
Clopper, E. N., Rural Child Welfare. Macmillan Co.
Committee on Social and Religious Surveys, 111 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y. (12 volumes of Rural Surveys. Published by Geo. H. Doran Company.)
Crow, Martha Foote, The American Country Girl. F. A. Stokes Co.
Douglas, H. Paul, The Little Town. Macmillan Co.
Dunn, A. W., Community Civics and Rural Life. D. C. Heath.
Earp, E. L., Rural Social Organization. Abingdon Press.
Fiske, George Walter, The Challenge of the Country. Association Press.
Galpin, C. J., Rural Life. Century Co.
Gillett, J. M., Rural Sociology. Macmillan Co.
Gillette, John M., Constructive Rural Sociology. Macmillan Co.
Groves, E. R., The Rural Mind and Social Welfare. Univ. of Chicago Press.
Haggard, H. Ryder, Rural Denmark and Its Lessons. Longmans.
Hayes, A. W., Rural Community Organization. Univ. of Chicago Press.
Kile, The Farm Bureau. Macmillan Co.
King, F. H., Farmers of Forty Centuries. Orange Judd Co.
Lindeman, E. C., The Community. Association Press.
MacGarr, Llewellyn, The Rural Community. Macmillan Co.
McKeever, W. A., Farm Boys and Girls. Macmillan Co.
McVey, F. L., The Making of a Town. McClurg.
Mead, Elwood, Helping Men Own Farms. Macmillan Co.
Phelan, John, Readings in Rural Sociology. Macmillan.
Plunkett, Sir Horace, The Rural Life Problems of the U. S. Macmillan Co.
Report of the Country Life Commission. Macmillan Co.
Sims, Newell LeRoy, Hoosier Village. Longmans.
Sims, Newell LeRoy, The Rural Community, Ancient and Modern. Scribners.
Vogt, Paul L. Introduction to Rural Sociology. D. Appleton & Co.
Wiley, H. W., Lure of the Land. Century Co.
Wilson, Warren H., Quaker Hill. Privately Printed.

Rural Economics

Agricultural Cooperation and Rural Credit in Europe, 1913. Senate Documents 214, 261, 63rd Congress.
Brooks, J. J., Market and Rural Economics: Science of Commerce and Distribution. Shakespeare Press.
Carver, Thomas Nixon, Selected Readings in Rural Economics. Ginn & Co.
Carver, Thomas Nixon, Principles of Rural Economics. Ginn & Co.
Carver, Thomas Nixon, The Religion Worth Having. Houghton Mifflin Co.
Coulter, J. E., Cooperation Among Farmers. Macmillan Co.
Herrick, Myron T., Rural Credits. D. Appleton & Co.
Hibbard, B. H., Marketing Agricultural Products. Appleton & Co.
Macklin, Theodore, Efficient Marketing for Agriculture. Macmillan Co.
Mormon, J. R., Principles of Rural Credit. Macmillan Co.
Mormon, J. R., The Place of Agriculture in Reconstruction. Dutton.
Nourse, E. G., Agricultural Economics. University Chicago Press.
Page, L. W., Roads, Paths and Bridges. Macmillan Co.
Poe, Clarence, How Farmers Cooperate and Double Profits. Orange Judd Co.
Powell, G. Harold, Cooperation in Agriculture. Macmillan Co.
Taylor, Henry C., Introduction to the Study of Agricultural Economics. Macmillan Co.
Van Hise, C. B., The Conservation of the Natural Resources of the U. S. Macmillan Co.
Warren, G. F., Farm Management. Macmillan Co.
Weld, L. D. H., The Marketing of Farm Products. Macmillan Co.

Rural Education

Betts, G. H. and Hall, O. A., Better Rural Schools. Bobbs-Merrill Co.
Bruere and Eggleston, The Work of the Rural School. Harper Bros.
Carney, Mabel, Country Life and the Country School. Rowe Peterson & Co.
Cubberly, E. P., Rural Life and Education. Houghton Mifflin Co.
Davis, E. E., Twentieth Century Rural School. Bobbs-Merrill Co.
Dewey, Evelyn, New Schools for Old. E. P. Dutton Co.
Foght, Harold W., The American Rural School. Macmillan Co
Foght, Harold W., Rural Denmark and Its Schools. Macmillan Co.
Foght, Harold W., The Country Teacher and His Work. Macmillan Co.
Hanifan, L. J., The Community Center. Silver, Burdett & Co.
Hart, J. (Editor), Educational Resources of Village and Rural Communities. Macmillan Co.
Hummell, W. G. and P. R., Material and Methods in High School Agriculture. Macmillan Co.
Kerns, J. O., Among Country Schools. Ginn & Co.
King, Irving, Education for School Efficiency. D. Appleton & Co.
Perry, C. A., Wider Use of the School Plant. Russell Sage Foundation.
Perry, C. A., Community Center Activities. Russell Sage Foundation.
Pickard, A. E., Rural Education. Webb.
Rapeer, Louis W., The Consolidated Rural School. Scribners.
Scott, G. A., Social Education. Ginn & Co.

Rural Church

Alexander, John L., The Teens and The Rural Sunday School. Association Press.
Beard, A. F., The Story of John Frederick Oberlin. Pilgrim Press.
Bricker, Garland C. and others, Solving the Country Church Problem. Eaton & Mains.
Brunner, Edmund deS., Cooperation in Cooperburg. Interchurch World Movement.
Brunner, Edmund deS., The New Country Church Building. Interchurch Movement.
Brunner, Edmund deS., The Country Church in the New World Order. Association Press.
Butterfield, Kenyon L., The Country Church and Rural Problem. Univ. Chicago Press.
Committee on Social and Religious Surveys, 111 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y. (12 volumes of Rural Surveys. Published by Geo. H. Doran Company.)
Country Life, Annals of American Academy of Political Science. Philadelphia.
Diffendorfer, R. E., The Church and the Community. Interchurch World Movement.
Douglas, H. Paul, From Survey to Service. Missionary Education Movement.
Earp, Edwin L., The Rural Church Movement. Association Press.
Earp, Edwin L., The Rural Church Serving Its Community. Abingdon Press.
Felton, Ralph A., The Study of a Rural Parish. Abingdon Press.
Felton, Ralph A., Serving the Neighborhood. Interchurch World Movement.
Gill, C. O., The Country Church. Macmillan Co.
Gill and Pinchot, Six Thousand Country Churches. Macmillan Co.
Groves, Ernest R., The Resources of the Country Church. Association Press.
Groves, Ernest R., Rural Problems of Today. Association Press.
Jackson, Henry E., The Community Church. Houghton Miffiin Co.
Miller, Elizabeth E., The Dramatization of Bible Stories. Univ. Chicago Press.
Mills, Harlow S., The Making of a Country Parish. Interchurch World Movement.
Morse, Richard, Fear God in Your Own Village. Henry Holt Co.
Richardson, N. E. and Loomis, O. E., The Boy Scout Movement Applied to the Church. Scribner.
Tipple, Ezra S., Some Famous Country Parishes. Abingdon Press.
Vogt, Paul L. (Editor), The Church and Country Life. Federal Council, N. Y.
Vogt, Paul L., Church Cooperation and Community Life. Abingdon Press.
Wagner, James E., Rural Evangelism. Methodist Book Concern.
Wilson, Warren H., The Church at the Center. Interchurch World Movement.
Wilson, Warren H., The Evolution of the Country Community. Pilgrim Press.
Wilson, Warren H., The Second Missionary Adventure. Fleming H. Revell Co.
Zumbrunnen, A. C., The Community Church. Univ. of Chicago Press.

Rural Recreation and Social Life

Bancroft, Jessie H., Games for Playground Home School and Gymnasium. Macmillan Co.
Bollman, Gladys and Henry, Motion Pictures for Community Needs. Henry Holt & Co.
Bryan, G. S., Poems of Country Life. Macmillan Co.
Chubb, Percival and associates, Festivals and Plays in Schools and Elsewhere. Harper Bros.
Community Service Incorporated, 1 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
Community Drama.
Community Music.
Recreative Athletics.
Fun for Everyone.
Rural and Small Community Recreation.
Curtis, Henry, Play and Recreation for the Open Country. Ginn & Co.
Geister, Edna, Ice Breakers. Woman's Press.
Johnson, G. E., Education by Plays and Games. Ginn & Co.
Masters, Edgar Lee., Spoon River Anthology. Macmillan Co.
Stern, Renee B., Neighborhood Entertainments. Macmillan Co.
Ward, E. J., Social Center. D. Appleton & Co.

Philosophy of Rural Life

Bailey, Liberty H., Country Life Movement. Macmillan Co.
Bailey, Liberty H., State and the Farmer. Macmillan Co.
Bailey, Liberty H., Holy Earth. Scribners.
Bailey, Liberty H., Wind and Weather. Comstock Publishing Co.
Butterfield, Kenyon L., The Farmer and the New Day. Macmillan.
Dahlinger, Chas. W., The New Agrarianism. Putnam.
Jackson, Henry E., What America Means to Me. National Community Board, Washington, D. C.
Russell, George W., Cooperation and Nationality. (New Edition Manunsel & Co., Dublin.) Normal Remington Co.

Farm and Home Problems

Buell, Jennie, One Woman's Work for Farm Women. Whitcomb & Barrows.
Dogg, Helen, Healthful Farmhouse. Whitcomb & Barrows.
Harris H. F., Health on the Farm. Macmillan Co.
Lynde, Carleton J., Home Water Works. Macmillan Co.
Ogden, H. N., Rural Hygiene. Macmillan Co.
Rural Health, Proceedings Second Country Life. Conference: Address E. C. Lindeman, Greensboro, N. C.

Civic Organization

Bird, C. S., Town Planning for Small Communities. D. Appleton & Co.
Fairlie, John A., Local Government in Counties, Towns and Villages. Century.
Farrington, Frank, Community Development. Ronald.
Field and Nearing, Community Civics. Macmillan.
Hart, Community Organization. Macmillan Co.
McClenahan, Miss B. A., Organizing the Community. Century.
Waugh, F. A., Rural Improvement. Orange Judd Co.

Fiction

Cather, Willa, My Antonia. Alfred A. Knopf.
Garland, Hamlin, Son of the Middle Border. Macmillan.
Hamsun, Knott, The Growth of the Soil. Macmillan.
Jones, Edgar DeWitt, Fairhope. Macmillan.
Nexö, John Anderson, Pelle. Henry Holt & Co.
Quick, Herbert, On Board the Good Ship Earth. Bobbs-Merrill.
Quick, Herbert, The Fairview Idea. Bobbs-Merrill.
Quick, Herbert, The Brown Mouse. Bobbs-Merrill.

22,023

7RN
1-25

C.A.

DATE DUE

United Theological Seminary Library
MAIN HT421.W5 1923
Wilson, Warre The evolution of the count
3 0645 0004 0465 3